Vol. IX.] JUNE [No. 2.

THE

MALABAR QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

K. N. SIVARAJAN, B. A.

CONTENTS.

		Page
I.	The Taj Mahal and Secundra (Akbar's Tomb), By Mr. M. A. WILLIAMSON.	81
II.	The Epics of India and Greece. By Mr. THOMAS C. RICE, B. A.	89
III.	The Great Duke of Florence—A Study. By Mr. M. S. PURNALINGAM PILLAI, B. A., L. T.	98
IV.	The Morality of the Ramayana—A Rejoinder—II. By Mr. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M. R. A. S.	107
V.	Ideals of the East and the West. By Prof. V. G. KALE, M. A.	120
VI.	The Ramayana and its Critics. By Mr. T. SADASIVA AIYAR B. A., M. L.	126
VII.	Flogging for Prison Offences in India. By Mr. JOSEPH COLLINSON.	129
VIII.	The Nautch Girl. By Mr. T. S. RAMA SASTRI.	131
IX.	The Law of Karma—II. By Prof. S. A. DESAI, M. A., LL. B.	134
X.	Organization. By The EDITOR.	146
XI.	Reviews and Notices.	154

Printed and Published by S. K. Pillai for the Proprietor,
at the P. J. Press, Trivandrum.

Annual Subscription, 1910 *Single Copy.*

THE

MALABAR QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

K. N. SIVARAJAN, B. A.

VOL. IX] JUNE, 1910 [No. 2.

THE TAJ MAHAL AND SECUNDRA (AKBAR'S TOMB).

BY MR. M. A. WILLIAMSON.

IT is biblically narrated that the Queen of Sheba, having heard of the wisdom of Solomon and the magnificence of the Jewish Temple, paid a visit to Jerusalem, coming all the way from Abyssinia, and being overpowered by splendours whose realities exceeded her anticipation, the Queen exclaimed, "Behold the half was not told me, thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the fame which I heard". Even so, after reading graphic descriptions of the Taj and hearing all the accounts relating thereto, when I actually beheld the Taj I was constrained to reiterate the ejaculation of the Queen of Sheba.

It is not possible that anyone, who has any sense for the sublime and the beautiful, could behold the Taj without being struck with amazement at the wonderful mechanical skill displayed in its construction and the exquisite beauty and perfect symmetry of this mausoleum, universally acknowledged to be one of the modern wonders of the world. This *chef d'œuvre* of architecture, known as *Taj.bebi-ka-Rauza* by the Indian population, or *Taj Mahal* by the European world, was erected by Shah Jehan, the grandson of Akbar the Great, in 1648, in the suburbs of Agra, as the tomb of his beloved wife Arjamand Benu Begum, known in History as Mumtáz Mahal. All those who have seen the Taj have spoken in glowing terms of rapture, one calling it "a dream in marble" and another "a dream of celestial

beauty". On a cursory observer the Taj does not impress very much, for by the very law of its construction the Taj slopes away from the eye in every direction, and like a modest maiden it rather eludes than courts observation. But as the beholder continues his gaze and as he prolongs his examination the Taj gains upon him and each look draws out further beauties. By the purity and richness of its workmanship, by the vastness of its mass, by the perfect symmetry and harmony of its construction, it conveys to the spectator a sense of grandeur and majesty scarcely to be equalled and compels him to exclaim, 'can this be the work of puny man?' This thing of beauty stands unrivalled and affords an illustration of the saying that "the Mughals designed like Titans and finished like jewellers". One of a romantic turn of mind is apt to think whether Shah Jehan had not genii at his command or possessed Alladin's wonderful lamp. The Taj is more of the heaven, heavenly, than of the earth, earthy. Words beggar description. The famous temples of Minakshi in Madura, or Srirangam in Trichinopoly, though grand after their kind, look poor and tawdry when compared to the Taj. A globe-trotter, who has seen the cathedrals of St. Peter's, Milan and Cologne, has said that they pale before the Taj; they may be all majestic, but the Taj is Enchantment itself, and so pure and perfect is the form that all other structures look sordid.

There is a gateway of red sandstone interlined with marble and it serves as a noble approach to the Taj. It is built of the purest Jaipur marble, the mausoleum stands on a raised platform, at each corner of which is a tall and graceful minaret, all of marble. The cupolas stand on the roof round the central dome and four large minarets at the four angles of the marble platform. The minarets are about 200 feet high and four minor domes or turrets surround the Taj and 16 little minarets, like satellites, outflank the turrets. Two handsome mosques face the Taj on the right and left, each constructed of sandstone inlaid with white marble and crowned with three white domes. The Taj is said to have cost over three millions sterling, took about twenty years to construct and employed twenty thousand workmen. It is described as representing the most highly elaborated stage of ornamentation, the stage at which the architect ends and the jeweller begins. The surface of the Taj is ornamented with the choicest inlaid work and richly adorned with precious stones. Some of the stones were however removed by the Government and spurious ones substituted. The windows are covered with fine marble screens of

graceful and intricate patterns. Extensive rows of arabic characters, said to be verses from the Koran, in black are inlaid into the white marble and they thickly cover the Taj and the Tombs.

It is related of Lord Macaulay that he knew by rote the whole of "Paradise Lost", and that if the books were lost, he could replace them; in like manner, the Taj could replace the Koran, so say the Moslems.

A member of Parliament who has seen the Taj has said that the first impression the Taj gave him was that of a temple of white ivory draped in Brussel's lace. This whiteness is slightly tinged with yellow and this adds to its beauty, as marble improves with age. The exquisite carving and tracery on the walls look more like lace than sculpture. Festoons of fruits and flowers in raised work are scattered about with a lavish hand in a glorious pell-mell. A splendid dome with a golden spire crowns the building and four graceful minarets stand in bold relief on four corners of the Taj, like sentinels. The building is square in form and with a great alcove or hollow arch in the middle of each side. Two smaller domes stand on the roof round the central dome. The tombs erected to Shah Jehan and his favourite wife Mumtaz Mahal are in the interior beneath the great dome, and the light percolates dimly through the marble fret-work Lord Curzon lately presented two huge and costly lamps manufactured by an expert workman of Egypt, after some old design of the Pharoahs, which took the expert three years to construct, and these illuminate the interior. The tombs of Shah Jehan and Mumtaz Mahal lie side by side; they are of white marble inlaid with rich gems and texts of the Koran are engraven on them. A dado runs round the interior, of marble exquisitely carved into flowers and other chaste designs. There is nothing bizarre or crude in the whole conception of the building. The foreground of the Taj is filled up with a grove of deep green foliage. In the middle of this grove lies a long narrow pool of water interspersed with fountains throwing out jets of water supplied from the Jumna and lined with cypress and other trees Bright-plumed birds peculiar to Northern India flit about the place and add to its beauty. The *tout ensemble* is very pleasing to the eye and looks like an oasis amid the parched and dusty plains of India. In regard to color and design, the Taj is said by connoisseurs, to rank first in the world for purely decorative workmanship; and the aerial grace of its domes and minarets exceeds the wildest dreams. The Taj, as said before, stands upon a large marble platform, which is raised

some feet above the ground, and this again rests upon a still larger basement of red sandstone. The building is thus raised above all the surrounding country and can be seen from a great distance. Distance, it has been said by a poet, lends enchantment to the view; the best distant sight of the Taj is from the new Jumna bridge, where the train, coming from Tundla to Agra, halts for a few minutes. From there the Taj looks like a lovely lighthouse over all the plains of Agra and is reflected on the broad bosom of the Jumna.

It is an old Italian saying "See Venice and die". I am almost tempted to say, to see the Taj and die will be something worth dying for.

Tradition relates that after building the Taj Shah Jehan wished to construct a similar one on the other side of the Jumna and connect the two with a silver bridge across the river. This magnificent project was nipped in the bud by Aurangzeb, the son of Shah Jehan. Aurangzeb, who had an eye to the throne, fearing that the coffers of Government would be emptied, took Shah Jehan prisoner and incarcerated him in the Fort of Akbar till his death. Vestiges of the incipient building still remain. It is also related that the architect who built the Taj came to an untimely end. After finishing the Taj, he was asked by Shah Jehan, if he could construct another such grand structure, and on his replying that if money and materials were supplied he could build even a better one, Shah Jehan, fearing another king might secure his services, got both his eyes extracted and threw him into a well.* This well, situated within the precincts of the Taj, is shown by the cicerones to this day; but yet the truth of the story must be vouched for by more convincing evidence.

Shah Jehan's ideas of grandeur and magnificence must have been of the superlative degree. Amongst other grand structures, it was he, who built the world-renowned mosque, the Jumna Musjid of Delhi and the Peacock Throne. The Peacock Throne is said to have cost nearly six millions sterling, in the calculation of professional European jewellers, the fantail of the bird being encrusted with precious stones imitating the hues of the bird. When Nadir Shah sacked Delhi he carried away the Peacock throne to Persia.

---

* This is probably another instance to show that very often Tradition turns itself to be the veriest dolt. If Shah Jehan had decided to get rid of the architect by throwing him into a well-a most unlikely method of murder by the bye—what necessity was there to inflict on him beforehand the altogether wanton barbarity of eye-extraction? The whole thing smacks of myth, pure and simple, and must be expunged from any narrative of the Taj as utterly incongruent with the ideas we generally associate with that thing of beauty and its builders. Ed. *M. Q. R.*

The Taj is beheld at its best when bathed in soft moonlight and the Tomb of Akbar looks grand and glorious in the sheen of the setting sun.

During the Amir of Afghanistan's visit to Agra three years ago, the Taj and the surroundings were lit with electric lights and illuminated with colored chirags. The sight was dazzling and beyond compare and brought to my mind the beautiful lines of Tennyson in his *Recollections of the Arabian Nights.*

"The fourscore windows all alight
As with the quintessence of flame,
A million tapers flaming bright
From twisted silvers looked to shame.
The hollow-vaulted dark and stream'd
Upon the mooned domes aloof
In inmost Agra; till their seem'd
Hundreds of crescents on the roof
Of night new risen, that marvellous time
To celebrate the golden prime
Of the great Shah Jehan"---

I have presumed to make a slight parody of the Poet's lines to suit the subject.

The Amir was so enchanted with the Taj, that he paid several visits thereto and on one occasion he met a soldier's daughter sight-seeing with her father, and the Amir being amused with the child presented her with a gold necklace set with precious stones.

Standing on the top of the minarets, you could have a bird's eye view of the place to a great distance. The massive fort of Akbar, with its huge double wall 70 feet high fills up the landscape on the West, and beyond is the City of Agra peeping out of a forest of trees; turn to the right, you behold looming before you churches and colleges; turn again, you see a great railway bridge spanning the Jumna. The Taj with its beautiful domes and garden is a sight worth seeing and beyond the wildest flight of fancy. It would seem as if nature made it and broke the mould. So much for the Taj and now to Secundra.

Secundra is situated about seven miles from Agra and it is here that the mortal remains of Akbar the great were interred. The tomb is said to be unlike any other tomb in India and the design partly borrowed from a Buddhist model. It stands in an extensive garden approached by a noble entrance. In the centre of the garden, on a raised platform, stands the tomb itself in the form of a pyramid. The lower story measures over 300 feet each way exclusive of the angle

towers. It is over 30 feet in height and pierced by ten great arches on each face, and with a lofty entrance adorned with a mosaic of marble in the centre. On this terrace stands another far more ornate measuring about 200 feet each side. A third and fourth of similar design stand on this, all these being of red marble enclosure, its outer wall being entirely composed of marble trellis-work of the most exquisite pattern. Inside it is surrounded by a colonnade or cloister of the same material in the centre of which, on a raised platform, is the tombstone of Akbar, a splendid piece of the most beautiful arabesque tracery. This however is not the actual burial place; the mortal remains of Akbar repose under a plain tombstone in a vaulted chamber in the basement, 3 feet square, just under the simulated tomb that adorns the summit of the mausoleum. The tomb is covered with a costly silk cloth of honor presented by Lord Northbrook, and on one of the pillars of the mausoleum once glittered the Kohinur, which after a series of adventures and passing through various hands came into the possession of the late Queen Victoria. The actual tomb of Akbar looks simple and severe in accordance with the dying wish of Akbar that his tombstone should be as plain as possible but no one could possibly view the tomb without being touched with the remarkable career of this great man, and Frederick Augustus, Count of Noer, in his account of the place, has said that no other burial-place has so much moved him as that of Akbar. Though Akbar did not live to a green old age and died before the allotted span of life of three score years and ten, yet his life was a most crowded one, full of thrilling events and noble acts. It is with bated breath one reviews all that Akbar has done during his momentous reign.

> "We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
> In feelings, not in figures on a dial,
> We should count time by heart-throbs, He most lives,
> Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best".

Judging by the above standard, Akbar's reign was a most eventful one, and the mighty deeds he has done for the amelioration of all classes of the people of India, irrespective of class, creed or color, will live in the heart and mouth of posterity for ages to come and certainly entitle him to a pre-eminent place in the muster-roll of the world's worthies. No devout believer passes by this mausoleum without wafting a prayer for the repose of Akbar's soul. On one of the windows are the 99 names of Allah from the Koran, and it is customary for parents to bring their sick children to the place and washing

over the names make them drink the water, that they may recover. It is believed that remarkable cures have thus taken place.

On either side of the entrance to the vaulted chamber containing Akbar's tomb, there are the graves of two of Akbar's daughters, a daughter of Aurangzeb and a few others of his near relations. There is another mausoleum popularly known as *Rauza Mariam*, erected in honor of Mariam or Mary, the Christian wife of Akbar and sister-in-law of Prince Bourbon of Navarre. It is a square building of red sandstone and comprises of two stories with a vault below the groundfloor containing about forty chambers. Each corner of the building is surmounted by a short ornamental octagonal tower and the building is known as the tomb of Akbar's Christian wife, said to be the mother of Emperor Jehangir. Her tomb is in the vault below and in the centre of the upper story is a white marble cenotaph. This building is used as a Printing Office by the Secundra Orphanage.

Close by the Mausoleum is the Secundra Orphanage, established in 1839 by the Church Missionary Society. There are about 400 Orphans of both sexes and they are trained to trades.

There is a remarkable history attached to the Secundra Orphanage. It appears a boy was found in the den of a wolf. Some natives, while passing a jungle in the Bulandshahr district, saw a boy about 5 or 6 years old, crawling about on all fours. As soon as the boy saw the men he ran and took refuge in a large hole. The hole was found to be the abode of a wild beast, and the natives fearing to venture farther, reported the matter to the Magistrate of the District, and he despatched some men to the spot, who lighted a fire at the mouth of the den and filled it with fumes, when out-rushed a she-wolf and in its trail, the boy. The she-wolf escaped, but the boy was captured and taken to the Magistrate, who sent him to the Secundra Orphanage. This took place in February 1867. The boy was speechless and exhibited all the traits of a wild animal. At first he refused vegetable food and accepted only raw meat; but gradually his animal propensities wore away and he commenced to walk upright, partake of vegetable food, and tolerated clothes. In 1877, he was baptised under the name of *Sanichar*, meaning Saturday, which was the day he was baptised. There are a goodly number of the old residents of Agra who have seen this prodigy, and he lived till about thirty. Hearing this, one feels almost inclined to credit the story of Romulus, the reputed founder of Rome, being nurtured by a she-wolf.

To conclude, amongst other buildings Agra can boast of three magnificent structures. "The Fort of Akbar", "the Tomb of Secundra", and "The Taj Mahal" stand foremost. In the first two, we admire the man, and in the last, the work. If I may so express it, the Fort and the Tomb evince masculine strength and vigor, and the Taj the beauty and charm of a handsome maiden. The Fort exhibits loftiness of thought, the Tomb majesty, and in the Taj, both are blended. They are buildings worth seeing, and I do not think, there breathes a man whose soul is so dead to all that is beautiful and sublime, as not to be moved and fascinated by these remarkable structures.

M. A. WILLIAMSON.

THE EPICS OF INDIA AND GREECE

The Ramayana and the Odyssey.

BY MR. THOMAS C. RICE B. A.

VII. THE *learning* of the Aryans in India in the heroic age was far more advanced than that of the Greeks in the same period. As we have noticed, there is only one doubtful allusion to writing in the Iliad; and though the Odyssey belongs to a later period, there is no more indication in it of the general use of the art of writing than in the older epic. Let us compare with this, the full account given in the Ramayana of the first stages of Rama's education. It is possible that these chapters were later additions to the original and this possibility tends to weaken any argument based on the text of the poems. It is sad to think that our faith in all old writings is thus enfeebled by doubts as to their real age. The only way to get over the difficulty is to assume for each the latest date possible, before making a comparison. We shall assume upon grounds which, we admit to ourselves, are not quite conclusive, that there was a difference of three centuries between the time when the Odyssey and the Ramayana took their final form, the former being the earlier. Rama was taught the alphabet in the primitive way that has survived almost down to our own times. The method was to write on the floor with chalk. In the picture given of Rama's school days mention is made of ink-bottles, satchels for carrying books, reeds and white palm leaves. Rama is said to have been proficient in *eighteen* languages. The historical significance of this fact is that the original Aryan language had branched out in India into eighteen Prakrit dialects spoken in as many Indo-Aryan kingdoms. The story of Rama going to school puts one in mind of the Roman legend of Virginia* and Appius, where the girl is represented with her tablets, going to school. On this slender foundation, if we are to base any conjecture as to the date of the Ramayana the art of writing must have been well understood in India in 450 B. C. More than that, the priestly class and the princes among the people must have been well educated up to the standard of learning of the time. † Rama was moreover taught grammar, astronomy,

---

* "A fair young girl came by with her small tablets in her hand and her satchel on her arm". —*Macaulay's Lay of Virginia*

† In the drama of *Sakuntala* (B. C. 50?) both the heroine and her maids are represented as able to read and write, and even to compose slokas in Sanskrit.

singing, music, dancing, painting, writing and composition, the management of elephants and chariots, leaping, vaulting and archery. This implies a pretty wide range of culture. The sections of the poem referring to the youth of Rama, the loves of Rama and Sita, before their exile and during it, are not *heroic* but *idyllic*; but as idylls, after the lapse of more than two thousand years at least they still retain their freshness, as being true copies from human nature as manifested in the morning of civilisation. Two parallel descriptions occur in the Ramayana, one of the approach of winter, the other of the rainy season. The former occurs in that portion of the poem relating to Rama's sojourn at Panchavati, the latter in the Neilgherri mountains. As the reference to frost and snow, to the southern declination of the sun, the shortness of days, the cultivation of wheat and barley, cannot refer to the region about the source of the Godavery, we must conclude that the poet had in view the winter season far to the north-west of India. The other picture is drawn from experience of the gathering of clouds in the Western Ghats about May, viewed from the mountains further inland. These companion pictures were probably *odes* that at one time existed independently but were afterwards incorporated in the Ramayana. If we ascribe to them the age of Theocritus, they should be dated about 300 B. C.

VIII. The *fondness* of the Hindus for *jewelry* and *personal decoration* was noticed even in early times by travellers from Europe.* The wearing of bracelets, necklaces, armlets and garlands of flowers by females is common enough and may be overlooked; but the Ramayana alludes to warriors in battle decked with profuse ornamentation. We turn to engravings of the Ninevan sculptures and at once find a clue to this custom. We find the Assyrian warriors wearing bracelets and waist-belts, evidently of the precious metals, with buckles, but neither ear-rings nor necklaces. The waist-belts were obviously intended for girding on the swords. We noticed among the armour of Menelaus, in the Iliad, a curiously-worked belt, but the Grecian warriors would have thought it unmanly to wear ornaments for the ear and neck. Even the cooks in the Maharaja's palace at Ayodhya were "adorned with earrings." Rama and Lakshmana were "adorned with beautiful earrings." The epithet appears to have come to be used as a mere poetical phrase. The palace guards

* According to Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador, "the people of India generally had but one extravagance, and that was love of ornament". Quoted by Wheeler, *Hist. of Ind.* Vol III, ch. 4.

have the same ornamental epithet applied to them. Indra "was adorned with splendid ornaments." The celestial youths, his attendants, wore rings in their ears, necklaces on their breasts. Rama is counselled to constantly show himself "adorned" to the people. The Indian warriors going to battle wore rich garments, and as the usual custom, decorated themselves with wristlets and armlets of gold, earrings and chains of gold round their necks. It would seem strange that men preparing to sacrifice themselves for some noble object, knowing full well that in a few hours they might be lifeless corpses, the repulsiveness of which no jewelry could soften, and that they were only preparing for their enemies a larger store of spoil, in the event of a reverse of fortune, should yet in the face of these considerations, pay so much attention to the decoration of their persons. But the spirit that animated them was perhaps the same as that which moved the minds of the Spartan heroes at Thermopylæ. A horseman of Xerxes who had gone forward to reconnoitre brought him the news that the handful of Spartans who were guarding the pass were practising gymnastics and combing their long hair. The king asked the Spartan Demaratus who was with him the meaning of these mad proceedings of his countrymen. The latter replied that it was the Spartan practice to dress their heads with peculiar care when they were going to hazard their lives.* After the disastrous battle of Cannae, Hannibal's brother Mago was sent to Carthage with the news of the victory, where he poured out on the floor of the senate-house a bushel of gold rings despoiled from the persons of the Roman knights who had fallen in the battle†.

IX. Western commentators find a difficulty in realising the genuineness of Rama's declaration that he preferred the life in the wilderness with his young and beautiful wife to the pomp and circumstance attending royal power as sovereign of Ayodhya. Of course in our own times, with the pleasures and comforts which the highest civilisation has to offer us, we can hardly imagine one, with all these at his command, voluntarily scorning them and perferring the hardships of life in a forest. But three thousand years ago, the attractions of what was then civilisation were fewer and less desirable. Much depends also on individual temperament. Individuals may be so constituted that the keenness of sensual perception is much more intense in some than in others; or, an over-sensitive nervous structure may be soon

* Smith's *Student's Greece*. Bk. III, ch. 18.
† Liddell's *Rome*. IV. 27.

cloyed with the merely sensual pleasures that life offered centuries ago. We know how Sakya Muni abandoned a palace and a young wife and retired into the wilderness. The exiled duke in the forest of Arden declares:

"This our life, exempt from public haunt,
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything,
I would not change it." *As You Like It.* Act II. Sc. 1.

We find authentic instances in history of men possessing absolute power, having at command all that made life enjoyable, who yet voluntarily resigned power and the luxury of a court for the seclusion of private life. The instances that immediately occur to us are those of Sylla and the emperor Charles V. We have no doubt that the annals of nations will furnish many more. It may be objected that the instances adduced are not exactly parallel, that the German Emperor was an aged man, fifty-five years old when he retired to the monastery of St. Just, that he had already tasted the sweets of power; there was time enough for him to have grown tired of them, and he found the burden of empire weighing heavy on his aged shoulders; ¶ whereas Rama was just attaining manhood, and he was at an age when the capacity for enjoyment was perfect, when the eagerness for an active life and for a life of luxury must be assumed to have been keenest. In the case of Sylla, the old Roman Dictator, it is said that he retired to his villa at Puteoli in order to have more leisure for sensual enjoyment, for which he had an excessive fondness. But, on the other hand, it has to be borne in mind that one to whom the luxury of a court was as yet but the image of a lively fancy, and who had not yet had opportunity of tasting the reality, would be more disposed to relinquish it than one to whom pomp and power had become the accessories of daily life. Again if Sylla had sensual gratifications of a very coarse nature to look forward to in his villa, Rama had a beautiful, young and affectionate wife who cheerfully shared the hardships of his exile.

X. In the Ramayana and the Odyssey, unlike the two corresponding poems the Mahabharata and the Iliad, the personality of the heroes, Rama and Ulysses, stand out so markedly in front of the other actors as to cast the importance of the latter in the perspective to a dim and hazy back ground. The interest of the action in the Iliad is not

¶ Historians have imagined all sorts of strange reasons to account for the abdication of the Emperor; what seems to have been the obvious reason, weariness with the burden of empire, not appearing to them sufficient. See Robertson's *Charles V.*

confined to Achilles. The other great figures, Agamemnon, Achilles, Ajax, Nestor, Hector, Paris, and a few others stand out in the foreground, so in the Mahabharata, we have great actors, Bhima, Arjuna, Krishna, Yudhishtira, Duryodhana, Bhishma, Karna and others. But in the Ramayana, Rama is an incomparably nobler and more clearly drawn character than the other pictures on the poet's canvas. The hermitages, with the sages inhabiting them, are colourless and dim. The faithful wife Sita has her counterpart in Penelope of the Odyssey. Lakshmana the brother of Rama in the one answers to Telemachus the son of Ulysses in the other. Ravana is the villain in the Indian epic; Antinous in the Greek. The aged king Dasaratha is of the same type as Drita-rashtra; pious and strictly observant of the forms of religion, but weak-willed and influenced by natural kindliness which pulled different ways and caused fatal vacillation in the policy of the kingdom; the former by his doting fondness for the girl-wife Kaikeyi; the latter by his love for his son Duryodhana, who shared the affections of the monarchs with their more worthy rivals Rama and Yudhistira.

Bharata's conduct in seeking Rama in his exile at Chitra-kuta, and passionately beseeching him to return to Ayodhya, may be viewed in different lights. To western commentators, it would seem a puzzle and even more unnatural than Rama's persistence in adhering to his original resolve. But in India his self-renunciation would be regarded as the meritorious dutifulness of a thoroughly good, honest and morally well-trained youth. From the most worldly point of view his conduct was highly expedient. He knew his own short-comings, that the reins of government needed a firmer and more experienced hand to guide them. He knew the temper of the nobles and people. Their wishes in the matter had been expressed most unequivocally It is well to note here, that in the age to which the poet's narrative relates, the government of the Kshatrya kingdoms, though absolute did not attempt to impose its will on an unwilling people. Before adopting the step of installing Rama as Yuvaraja, the king consulted his ministers, nobles, spiritual advisers and important citizens, and the expression of their consent decided the policy of the state. Lakshmana advised Rama to seize the government and depose the aged Maharaja. Such a step might possibly have been actually followed in similar cases in those times, and in the case of Rama would have met with popular approval. Bharata might have reigned contrary to the will of the people and if he had been a Turk or an Afghan, he

might have compelled his subjects to obedience by impaling, flaying or burying alive a few hundreds of the refractory populace. But as a Hindu, nursed in the high moral code propounded by the ancient *rishis*, such a course would have been abhorrent to him. It seems to have been acknowledged as a law of the state that the sovereign might nominate any one of his sons as his successor, although the law of primogeniture certainly existed but was meant to direct not to control, his choice; for the nobles and great men of Ayodhya acquiesced in the supercession of Rama and sent messengers to Bharata as the rightful heir, to come and take possession of the throne. In the corresponding scene in the Odyssey that gives us a glimpse of constitutional government among the Greeks, the nobles of Ithaca appear to have possessed an amount of authority that greatly limited the kingly power. The young nobles in the palace of Ulysses behaved with an insolence that would never have been permitted in a large and well-consolidated despotism. These magnates probably exercised a considerable check on the royal power like that of the barons in England in the time of the Plantaganets, or the nobles of Spain in the small Spanish kingdoms before they were consolidated under Charles V and Philip II. After the annhilation of the younger members of the aristocracy in Ithaca by Ulysses, their kinsfolk and retainers raised a rebellion which was quelled; but except for the wealth and abundance in the king's domains and the luxury of the nobility the Odyssey gives us no insight into the condition of the people generally. They were probably thought unworthy of consideration, and their condition might have been wretched enough. The Hindu bard on the contrary portrays Ayodhya as a city where general happiness prevailed, where the high and the low alike enjoyed a considerable share of the good things of the world. In the Odyssey, we might point to a passage in this connection in which a regard for popular opinion is expressed. Nausicaa the daughter of king Alcinous of Scheria says that if the rude shepherds and peasantry of her father's kingdom saw her accompanied by a stranger, they might in their rudeness and natural want of delicacy, be unable to understand her situation and invent some scandal about her after their manner. The islands engaged in a brisk commerce, rapidly acquired a freedom and independence which took long to penetrate into the purely pastoral and agricultural regions.

XI The domestic animals known to the ancient Indians were the horse, the ox, the dog, the elephant, and probably the cat. The

horse was highly valued and used in war. Couriers carried their messages on horseback, and the warrior class were trained in horsemanship. Chariots drawn by two or four horses were used in battle. The ancient Assyrians, a semitic nation, used horses highly caparisoned, in war, as we might see from their sculptures; but the Hebrews of Palestine, another semitic race, and their kindred tribes settled in their neighbourhood employed the ass instead of the horse. The emissaries of Sennacherib king of Assyria taunted the Jews with their inability to ride on horse back;* although horses were imported into Palestine from Egypt in the days of king Solomon† (in B C. 992) who possessed twelve thousand horsemen, probably mercenaries. The Scythians had domesticated the horse and valued it highly. Among the Greeks the horse was used in war; but only when harnessed to chariots. Hunting dogs are mentioned in the Homeric epic as the usual attendants on kings and nobles. Telemachus was usually attended by two dogs; dogs were sculptured in the palace of Alcinous. Eumaeus, the swine-herd of Ulysses, had four dogs to guard his hogs. All readers of the ancient classics must be familiar with the pathetic story of Ulysses' favourite dog Argus. In the Ramayana it is related that Raja Aswapati gave to his grandson Bharata when he was returning to Ayodhya "excellent elephants, variegated woollen clothes, deer-skins and other presents. He also gave him *certain large dogs* brought up in the inner apartments of the palace which were as strong and ferocious as tigers and well-armed with teeth; and 22,000 pieces of gold". The Hebrew writers never mentioned the dog except as a sign of hatred and contempt. The domestication of elephants in India must have been practised from very early times, long preceding the age of the two Indian epics. In these the use of the elephant in war and on state occasions is mentioned as a common practice. In the battle of the Jhelam‡ fought between king Porus and Alexander the great a a squadron of elephants formed one division of the Indian army, and it is related that the sight and smell of these formidable animals caused a panic among the horses of Alexander's cavalry. The method of taming the elephants was very much like what is still practised.

"Ask the elephants of jungle how their captors catch and bind,
Not by fire and feeble weapons, but by treason of their kind,
Not by javelin or arrow,—little for these arms they care,

* II. Kings. xviii. 23.

† I Kings. ch. X, 28 Ravana's chariot was drawn by *asses*, in contrast to those in the Aryan settlements where *horses* were used for the same purpose.

‡ B. C. 327.

But their false and fondling females lead them to the hunter's snare".
—Dutt's *Trans. of the Ram.*

It is said that the city of Ayodhya during the absence of the citizens who accompanied Bharata to Chitrakuta was traversed by *cats* and owls and bereft of elephants. If the word translated "cat" in this passage refers to the same species as our domestic animal, then it is a proof that cats were reared in their houses by the ancient Indians, either as pets or as a protection against vermin. Again, Hanuman assumed the size of a cat to enter Lanka. If the Rakshasas were akin to the ancient Egyptians or received their civilisation from Egypt, cats must have been sacred animals among them and the spy consulted his personal safety by disguising himself as a cat, if that is the meaning of the sentence.

XII. The state of the arts among the Greeks in the time of the Odyssey must have been very backward. They obtained golden embossed bowls and other productions of art from the Phœnicians either by barter or piracy, but among themselves such articles were not produced at that time. These arts must have been afterwards introduced by captives or hired workmen from Asia, like Huram of Tyre who was employed by king Solomon. In the maritime cities the industries connected with ship-building had been carried to an advanced stage. Penelope and her maidens were engaged in weaving a figured shroud. But the curious description given of Ullysses' bridal bedstead constructed by his own hands points to a very primitive time. It is difficult from the poet's description to realise the exact form and shape of this antique piece of furniture. It appears to have been something between a bedstead and a hammock. An olive tree *in situ* formed the base of it. The trunk of this tree denuded of its branches seems to have been split in two, taking advantage of the elasticity of the still green tree. Between the fork of the trunk thus cleaved, a frame-work appears to have been inserted, and kept from swaying by four supports at the corners. The frame was corded with narrow strips of leather running parallel and crosswise, which passed through holes bored with a gimlet. In contrast with this we notice in the palace of Dasaratha every article of luxury and civilisation; carpets, silken bed-spreads, ornamental umbrellas, golden couches.

The date of the Ramayana is as hard to fix as that of any other ancient writings sacred or secular. We have to consider in these cases the date of the earliest legends as well as the time when they

assumed their final form. In the case of the Ramayana, the poem has not been added to by continual insertions of all sorts of extraneous matter. The Mahabharata, on the other hand, has been made the repository of all the Hindu learning of centuries, in theology, cosmography, law, ethics and government. The number of irrelevant legends introduced into the Ramayana is small. There are also a few idylls and odes of great beauty that one is not disposed to part with. But much of the poem consists of duplications and triplications of the same chapters without material alteration. It would seem that there were different versions of the poem and the compiler put them together with the corresponding chapters side by side. The Ramayana together with the story of Nala appear as episodes in the *Vana Parva* of the Mahabharata. There is no material difference between the story of the Ramayana as it appears in the sister poem and in the independent version, except for the addition of the loosely joined on legends and lyrics unconnected with the main story. It is a question of interest to ask which of the two forms is earlier, and this can only be answered by a critical study of the text, such as the poems of Homer have been subjected to in Europe. Competent scholars say that the episode of the Ramayana in the Mahabharata is written in an earlier form of Sanskrit than the poem in which it is imbedded. The earliest form of the Ramayana may be put back to about 450 B. C.; and the same allusions as in the Mahabharata to the Yavanas, Pallavas and Sakas, that is, to the Greeks, Parthians and Skythians will prove that the latest additions were made at the same epoch in both poems. An attempt has been made to fix the date of the Ramayana by the reference to Taxilla (Takshasila), the town that Alexander arrived at and which is supposed to have been founded by Bharata's son Taksha. * But Takshasila may mean the fortress of the Takshaks, a Turanian race of serpent-worshippers. Euripides wrote the play of the *Cyclops*, founded upon an episode in the Odyssey; so also Kalidasa has made incidents in the Ramayana the subject of a poem. Such legends will not be employed as the topics of subsequent poems until a long time has elapsed. The Odyssey was put in its present form about 530 B. C. The date of Euripides' play may be roughly put at 430 B. C., a distance of a hundred years. The date of Kalidasa has been shifted by modern historians from 57 B. C to about 200 A. D, so that the Ramayana may have assumed its present form between 150 B. C., and 200 A. D. This is weak reasoning, but mathematical certainty is unattainable in inquiries like the present involving legends and ancient history.

THOMAS C. RICE.

---

*. See Introduction to Dutt's Translation of the Ramayana.

THE GREAT DUKE OF FLORENCE—A STUDY.

BY MR. M. S. PURNALINGAM PILLAI, B A., L. T.

VERY few indeed among the Jacobean dramatists have come down to us in all their glory excepting Ben Jonson, the poetical son of Spenser, and Beaumont and Fletcher, the Dioscuri of the Elizabethan stage. Philip Massinger was the most direct follower of the tragic Shakespeare. Distinguished as a master of dramatic construction and as an admirable story-teller to boot, he was equally great as a student of history and as an honest satirist of social abuses. Philip Massinger was a product of his period, and every play of his reflects faithfully the temper of the court and society under the first Charles. *The Great Duke of Florence* is an exquisite example of it, and in this purely delightful tragi-comedy, we see an old English story transferred to Italian soil—a story already known to the English stage—and rounded off with 'a happy conclusion, with its good humour, forgiveness and friendship all round.' Presenting as it does 'the sweetest and most delicate side of Massinger's genius,' it is not altogether free from that lack of imagination and grip, that want of mastery over the passions and of direct appeal to the heart that characterise his three dozen dramas written for the stage. Yet "there is something almost of Shakespeare's charm in people and events; in the princes and courtiers, without ceremony and without vice, uttering pretty sentiments prettily, and playing elegantly at life; in the simple lovers, with their dainty easy trials and crosses on the way to happiness; in the villain who does not know real harm and whom nobody can hate."

Once upon a time there was at Florence a Duke called Cozimo the Great. Distinguished for his humanity and generosity and for many other agreeable virtues, he treated his councillors with great respect and lent a patient ear to the grievances, if any, of his subjects. So he was loved and reverenced by the Florentines, high and low, and everything went off merrily as a marriage-bell.

God always tests good men. Having lost his fair and inimitable Duchess Clarinda only two years ago, this Great Duke could not reconcile his mind to go in for another partner, and the councillors of state were very anxious for a heir to succeed him. "In her grave we buried all thoughts of woman"! and he being in this frame of mind, the remonstrances of his beloved subjects fell on deaf ears. On one occasion they importuned him so much that he relented. But

having made his vow, he said he could not break it and take to wife the ward of Urbin as suggested by them. However, he met their wishes, so far as a heir was necessary, and pitched upon the only son of his sole sister whom he had the singular misfortune to lose just at the time of his sad bereavement of the Duchess. This heir presumptive was Giovanni, a fair youth who had much of the mother in him. Desiring to train him up in a way well-fitted to bear the yoke of the government of the fair Duchy, the great Duke sent him off to a country seat and placed him under the tutorship of the famous Carolo Charomonte. Far away from the distracting blandishments of the court, the youth was brought up in all the arts and sciences, in horsemanship, wrestling and music, that, to all intents and purposes, he was well equipped for the assumption of sovereign power. Endowed with sharp wit and pregnant apprehension as well as with a sweet and charming disposition, young Giovanni found in his tutor a second father and would often compare him to Chiron, tutor to the great Achilles. Under the wise direction of the fatherly tutor and the refining influence of his incomparable daughter, the heir presumptive learned in a brief term of three years all the high mysteries of court-life in the rural precincts of Charomonte and almost found a second home in the far-off retreat. When he was thus happy in his new surroundings, the Great Duke sent for his nephew and despatched his secretary Contarino for conducting the future ruler of Florence. The secretary arrived at the handsome pile of the tutor and delivered the message to him. The scene that follows is interesting and impressive. The prince who loved his second home so well and his second father so truly could not take an easy farewell; he could not part himself from the sweet and ravishing companionship of Lydia, a paragon of women, and the old tutor simply played the woman at the sight of the dumb rhetoric of his pupil. "My toughness melts," says Charomonte, "and spite of my discretion, I must turn woman". Even the country servant Calandrino glows with the panegyric of the prince "as the flower of the country's garland, and as the sun but for whose presence there could be neither spring nor summer but a perpetual winter". The uncle's order must be obeyed: there were embraces and demonstrations of love at the inevitable separation. The scene was so touching that the secretary who was witnessing it fell to saying, "What a sympathy there is between them." There followed an interesting conversation between Calandrino and the Florentine secretary, which throws a flood of light on the ways and manners of

the court of the times. The merry rural servant feared that the lips of the handsome prince might be kissed off at court and that he might be set upon by Succubae, who would 'handsel his lime twig". He further expatiated on the metamorphosing character of court-life on his own apprehended loss of honesty and turning a knave and a beggar. At this juncture Lydia came up on the scene to take her last leave of the prince, when Giovanni's natural affections mingled with his knowledge of the false greatness of great place burst forth into an excellent speech which for its sentiment we cannot but transcribe here.

"Greatness with private men
Esteemed a blessing, is to me a curse;
And we whom, for our high births, they conclude
The only freemen, are the only slaves.
Happy the golden mean had I been born
In a poor sordid cottage, not nursed up
With expectation to command a court,
I might like such of your condition, sweetest,
Have taken a safe and middle course, and not,
As I am now, against my choice, compelled
Or to lie grovelling on the earth or raised
So high upon the pinnacles of state,
That I must either keep my height with danger,
Or fall with certain ruin".

In his raptures over her love, beauty and accomplishments, he thought that the occasion had grown ripe for hymeneal joys and embraced her. But the sensible Lydia knew that her social position was too low to permit any such saucy hopes being entertained and wished to live and die as the humblest hand-maid of the happy children he might beget on a princess of equal rank and true as steel to him. Thus leaving the rural home amidst sorrows and tears, Giovanni and Contarino arrived at the Court and greeted the impatient Duke, when Cozimo said:

"My nephew, let me eye thee better, boy
In thee, methinks, my sister lives again;
For her love I will be a father to thee,
For thou art my adopted son."

Pleased with the hopeful prince whom he had provided for the throne 'without a second bed,' he sent him to rest and bade Sanazarro attend to him. After seeing them off, Cozimo asked Contarino to recount his personal experiences in the rural seat, whereupon the secretary grew eloquent over fair Lydia, 'the substance of all perfection,' her matchless form, pure soul, sweet discourse, ravishing

behaviour, charming language, and enchanting manners, such as could make Ulysses lose all thought of Penelope or Ithaca. This glowing effusion naturally induced the Great Duke to enquire if there was any passage of affection between Lydia and his nephew. His reply was, "how it should be otherwise between them is beyond my best imagination." At this the Great Duke gently rebuked him, saying that though he was skilled in politic designs of state, he could not be all right in his judgment of a beauty, and told him to attend to the urgent letters of state received during his absence touching the state of Urbin. Having despatched the secretary about his business, the Great Duke fell into a strain of surprise and resolved to make a strict inquiry of the diamond so long concealed from his view. The 'too modest' Sanazarro was deputed for the work—the "industrious bee"

> "Whose merits, though with him we should divide
> Our Dukedom, still continue us his debtor."

The trusted favourite, who was pure and tried gold was to eye the "masterpiece in nature" and submit a true report as expeditiously as possible. The royal emissary was received with due honours, and foreseeing that his mission was to have a smack at his daughter the old father told her to trim herself up to the height. Meanwhile, Sanazarro fell into a fit of musing melancholy over the hard task of peering through the paintings and plasterings of a beauty and then delivered the message to the old gentleman. His peerless daughter sailed into their midst, when he was lost in ecstacy.

> "Where am I?
> I feel myself another thing! Can charms
> Be writ on such pure rubies? her lips meet
> As soon as touched! Not those smooth gales that glide
> O'er happy Araby or rich Sabæa,
> Creating in their passage gums and spices,
> Can serve for a weak smile to express
> The sweetness of her breath. Such a brave stature
> Homer bestowed on Pallas, every limb
> Proportioned to it."

In this transport he, a man of flesh and blood and with affections like other men, could not but rend his loyalty to his master.

> "Who can behold the temples,
> On holy altars, but the objects work
> Devotion in him? And I may as well
> Walk over burning iron with barefeet
> And be unscorched, as look upon this beauty

Without desire, and that desire pursued too
Till it be quench'd with the enjoying those
Delights which to achieve, danger is nothing,
And loyalty but a word".

He added that the Great Duke should not have tried his constant temper in that way and tempted his allegiance too far. Returning to his senses, he began to hasten back to Florence, when Lydia asked him to do her the favour of making a tender of her humble service to Prince Giovanni. Sanazarro desired to know if she would give the prince hope of future happiness, to which she replied, "the fort that is yielded at the first assault is hardly worth the taking". After the customary parting kiss from that "magazine of all perfection", he gallopped off and Charomonte advised his daughter how to behave in the society of great men, to be neither coarse nor harsh nor credulous neither nice nor scrupulous, but to be wise at all times:

"For great men,
Till they have gained their ends, are giants in
Their promises, but, those obtained, weak pigmies
In their performance! And it is a maxim
Allowed among them, so they may deceive,
They may swear anything, for the queen of love,
As they hold constantly, does never punish,
But smile at lovers' perjuries."

Giovanni ever-dreaming of Lydia paid a visit to the Duchess of Urbin and discoursed to her on the pleasures and pastimes of the country seat and on the epitome of womanly virtues found there, till she was tempted to ask for the matchless virgin to wait upon her. She, on her part, exchanged her confidences with him, her love for the brave Count Sanazarro "more courtly then young Antinous," her great solicitude on his behalf as he was not 'a wall to stand the fury of a perpetual battery,' and the great need that he had for rest and liberty. At this sweet moment Cozimo dropped in, and though solicitous of the continuance of their interview, feared that "too much taken at once of the most curious viands might dull the sharp edge of appetite" and took them out with him for sports.

Sanazarro returned from his happy tour and found himself in desperate straits. Loyalty and amour struggled hard for triumph and being bound to speak true, could not make up his mind to submit a false report, colliding with that of Contarino. It struck him that the secretary being his creature could be won over and made to eat his words, if necessary. As regards Giovanni, he brought him ... that Cozimo wished to have Lydia for a

second bed, and that he should therefore cry down her beauties in his presence. The unsophisticated Prince felt some twinges of conscience and yet fell in with his scheme. Thus having assured himself that he was free from the horns of a dilemma, Sanazarro met the Great Duke and was asked of Lydia, "this phoenix of our age." The Count's version did not at all tally with that of the Secretary, and, though the Secretary pleaded that he was not so sharp-sighted as the Count, Cozimo would have the Prince's say on the matter. His answer was brief: "She is a handsome picture and that said, all is spoken." These contradictory reports could not be true and the Great Duke resolved to form an estimate of her with his own eyes. Just then Piorinda—that was the name of the Duchess—broke in and dilated on the varied virtues of Lydia as painted by the Prince himself, on her beauty, music, ravishing discourse, quick wit, exquisite manners, and sound learning. All were now in a fix: the Count and the Prince thought that they were in the jaws of death, while the Great Duke felt that he was trifled with.

"Ha! are we trifled with?
Dare they do this? Is Cozimo's fury, that
Of late was terrible, grown contemptible?
Well; we will clear our brows, and undermine
Their secret works, though they have digged like moles,
And crush them with the tempest of my wrath
When I appear most calm. He is unfit
To command others that knows not to use it,
And with all rigour: Yet my stern looks shall
Discover my intents; for I will strike
When I begin to frown."

Courage mounteth with the occasion, and the inventive brain devises something new to get out of the noose. The half-truth which the Prince had uttered sat like a night-mare upon his breast and gave him neither rest nor peace of mind. The scheming Count hit upon the expedient of sending the country servant to Lydia with a request to metamorphose herself when the Great Duke should call there and the suggestion obtained his approval. Calandrino was sent for, and he who at his first coming to Court thought "great women were privileged to carry musk cats" could not on the eve of his departure refrain from performing his antics reflecting on the corrupting influence of the courtly life on dress and character.

The plot was now in its full swing. Sanazarro, Giovanni, and Cozimo were fretting at their hearts, and Lydia grew sad and retired

and was being cheered up by Charomonte. The heir of Urbin was pining for the Count and her innocent speech ran her best friends into danger. How far the proposed metamorphosis could help to unravel the tangled skein was awaited with evident anxiety, and the clownish messenger was on his way home. His arrival there was most opportune. The dance arranged for needed him most. The servants Caponi, Bernardo, and Petruchio hailed the advent of Calandrino and had their lusty performance. Calandrino, the town-polished rustic, conferred with Lydia and delivered the letter to her. She kissed it, unripped the seal with great reverence as it were some holy writ, and read it as follows: "I have received so many favours from you that it would be an act of impudence to press you any more; but I am in difficulties, and my difficult position tempts me to ask you your grace. If you deny it, I must die unpitied. I shall be brief; for haste cuts off circumstance. My uncle is enamoured of your beauty and comes to see you. If you appear in your natural beauty, my hope of marrying you will be gone. Therefore devise how to prevent it. By doing so, you save two lives and bind me the honourer of your virtues ever more to you." Pity runneth soon in gentle heart Lydia settled in her mind that one of her servants should personate her at the Great Duke's levee.

Cozimo and his retinue arrived at Charomonte's. At the sudden sight of the royal troupe, the old tutor wept tears of joy and marked the day with red lead in the calends of his humble family. Giovanni trembled that he had overshot himself; Sanazarro would stand the hazard and 'hope the best'. The fiery Duke charged Charomonte with abuse of trust and with treason and kept him a close prisoner in his chamber till the cloud of suspicion cleared up. The ever-loyal tutor guessed what it was that had set the Duke's back up against him and grew so vehement that he told the royal guest to transform Lydia into an ugly leper, taint her sweetness, and prostitute her to a brothel had she cast one unchaste look at the prince in their rambles and reveries in the silient groves. Hardly was this said when Sanazarro was ordered to bring Lydia. Petronollo was brought in amid her drinks and junkets and Cozimo bade Galandrino sit with her enthroned and drink as a Duke. In the dance that followed, Petronollo fell down and was carried away. Cozimo pitied Charomonte's wretched fortune in a monster daughter and wished himself away. The impatience of Sanazarro to quit the scene provoked Cozimo's

exclamation: "Who signed you a patent to direct us? Wait our coming in the garden." At this imperious command, all made their exit, while Cozimo thought within himself:

> "Can it be
> That Contarino could be so besotted
> As to admire this prodigy? Or her father
> To doat upon it? Or does she personate
> For some ends unknown to us, this rude behaviour
> Which in the scene presented would appear
> Ridiculous and impossible?

It was really ridiculous and impossible that Lydia should behave so rudely! The close prisoner was interviewed by the Duke, when he denounced the charge of intemperance laid at her door and went to fetch her. Meanwhile, the Great Duke thought "we are abused; it is too apparent". Lydia pleaded indisposition and said that she could not stir from her chamber. The father's entreaty bore sway. She knelt before the Duke, when he felt fully convinced of the truth of Contarino's report and of the humbug played upon him. Lydia was sober, beautiful and graceful and had a musical voice. In his utmost vexation and resentment, Cozimo ordered Sanazarro and the ungrateful nephew to be seized and imprisoned in separate chambers—an order which was immediately executed, though it was a perfect enigma to the good old host. Then Cozimo burst out with: "O my abused lenity from what height is my power fallen"! Lydia, who was in the know, saw at once what dire fate awaited the gallant prince and made a fervid plea for the release and pardon of the self-convicted offender. Like Myrrha she knelt and prayed for forgiveness. A lowly shrub or a molehill though she was as opposed to the lofty cedar and to Olympus, her apt and graceful language, her readiness to die for the gallant prince who was rash only on her own account made a deep impression on the enraged lion and moved him to relent. "An eagle that bears thunder on her wings will not destroy her hopeful young for suffering a wren to perch too near them".

Plunged in self-recrimination, Sanazarro dwelt in turn upon his disobedient treachery, upon the fall of his greatness, upon the imperious beauty which trod upon the neck of understanding and compelled him to put off his natural shape of loyal duty and disguise himself in the cobweb mask of treachery, and said:

> "It is proved in me: the curse of human frailty,
> Adding to our afflictions, makes us know
> What is good, and yet our violent passions force us
> To follow what is ill."

Past redemption he thought he was and a ray of hope nevertheless darted across his mind. Piorinda alone could intercede and with her his hope of rescue lay. He took off the ring he wore, wrote with it on a pane of glass, and slid it down as she passed by. It read thus: "He whom you please to favour is cast down past hope of rising by the Great Duke's frown if by your gracious means he cannot have pardon; and that got, he lives your slave". These touching lines had their desired effect. She made bold to interfere and do her level best with the Duke who was determined to do noble justice by the disloyal. "The prince that pardons the first affront to majesty invites a second, rendering that power, subjects should tremble at, contemptible. Ingratitude is a monster to be strangled in the birth, not to be cherished". Piorinda, in company with the three councillors, Alphonso, Hippolito and Hiranimo, made suit to the irate Duke, to which he said, "He is a traitor to you, to us, to gratitude." As she pardoned his fault, she pleaded that it behoved him also to show his usual lenity to the delinquent Count who had erewhile been his *alter ego*. Sanazarro was crestfallen, Giovanni was in terrible suspense. Lydia had already sued for him. Charomonte lamented his telling one untruth and prayed for mercy. "This gloss defends not the corruption of the text", observed the Duke. All the councillors pressed forward and fell upon their knees on behalf of the Prince. The good Cozimo, Cozimo the Great, bade them rise and told them that if Lydia would exhibit her excellency and judge her detractors as Duty's Queen, he would withdraw;—an exhibition of vanity which drew from Alphonso the *obiter dictum* "great princes have like meaner men their weakness". Lydia accordingly appeared with her arched brow, sparkling eyes, and ruby lips-lilies bashed with roses with her neck like a rock of crystal, and with a fluent tongue. Giovanni and Sanazarro lay low on the ground—the men who, in the Duke's opinion had endeavoured to spout the poison of their black detraction on her immaculate whiteness. The ladies were seated in the chairs of state, and the Great Duke, who "high on a throne of royal state exalted sat", accused Sanazarro of treachery and Giovanni of faithlessness, the two keys as it were that opened his heart's secrets. Both confessed a guilty cause and were forgiven. After a touching reference to fair Clarinda and his widowed bed, Cozimo closed the pathetic scene, bidding the lovers join their hands as long ago their hearts had been united. Giovanni married Lydia, Sanazarro Piorinda, and Calandrino Petronollo; and the union of the last was intended to avoid the extinction of such chopping mirth-makers of both sexes as shall preserve perpetual cause of sport both to his grace and to his posterity. All was well that ended well and Love's labour was lost and won.

M. S. PURNALINGAM PILLAI

THE MORALITY OF THE RAMAYANA—A REJOINDER—II.

BY MR. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M. R. A. S.

BALI, or Vali, Sugriva and Rama.—In discussing their character, it appears to me necessary, to state the facts at length as recorded by Valmiki, that there may be no misconception. Of the two brothers, Vali was the elder and Sugriva the younger. The former was sitting on the throne of his ancestors, at the time of the visit of Rama and Lakshmana, bv right of primogeniture and Sugriva was in exile in the Rishyamuka Hills. Long before his banishment, when he was living with his brother on friendly terms, on a certain night, an Asura by name Mayavi, repaired to the gates of Kishkinda and challenged Vali to fight, owing to some love affair. In spite of the advice of all interested in him, including Sugriva, he accepted the challenge and ran out to meet him. Out of affection and regard Sugriva followed him. At the sight of the brothers the demon fled for his life and took refuge in a cave. Disappointed as Vali was, he was not prepared to give up the chase. He turned to his brother and asked him to watch the mouth of the cave carefully till his return. Sugriva tried to dissuade him from his impetuous course, but Vali was inexorable and made his brother swear by his feet that he would carry out his injunctions. He tarried at the entrance to the cave for one full year, and the only sign of life there were the roaring sound of Mayavi and the streaming of frothy blood from the cave. Sugriva concluded that his brother was dead, shut up the cave with a stone "as huge as a hill," performed his last rites, returned to Kishkinda, and refrained from mentioning the facts to anybody. But the ministers of Vali learned them and in consultation with the people installed him on the throne of his brother. While he was thus reigning, Vali returned to the mouth of the cave, found it barred and called Sugriva by name. But as there was no response he was in a state of despair. With a great effort he kicked away the stone and betook himself to Kishkinda. On the reappearance of his brother, Sugriva surrendered the crown, explained to him that it was set on his head for the defence of the kingdom, tried to propitiate him, and besought him to forgive him. But Vali was not appeased. He slew the ministers who were instrumental in placing his brother on the throne, deprived Sugriva of his wife, and banished him from the kingdom with only a strip of cloth round his loins. From that time

up to the moment of the arrival of Rama and Lakshmana, he was living on the Rishyamuka Hills, which Vali was debarred from approaching owing to an imprecation on the part of sage Madanga.§

After the abduction of Sita, when the brothers were at their wit's end to find out its author and her whereabouts, they appealed to Kabandha who had assumed the celestial form of Danu, and he directed them to go to Kishkindha and seek the aid of Sugriva, who was in the same plight as Rama was.† On their arrival at the Malaya hills in the Madanga forests, the brothers were anxious to seek an interview with Sugriva, but he espying them from a distance took them for Vali's spies in disguise, and took the necessary precautions to guard himself and his friends against any untoward danger. After, however, holding counsel with his brethren in adversity (for there were some who were sent into exile at the same time with Sugriva, such as Hanuman, Nalan, Neelan &c.,) he made up his mind to depute Hanuman to go to the youthful heroes, learn the object of their mission, and secure if possible their assistance in encompassing the death of Vali and ending his tyrannical rule. His mission was successful. Hanuman went in the guise of a mendicant, reconnoitered the position, and finding that there was nothing suspicious, he informed them of the object of his visit, which was of course quite welcome to them. Rama and Lakshmana at once, in the company of Hanuman, proceeded to the residence of Sugriva, and concluded a defensive and offensive alliance. The object of this was that Rama should bring about the death of Vali, and place Sugriva on his throne. The latter was on his part to assist him in the recovery of Sita.‡

The next step was the fulfilment of the promises. Impelled by Rama, Sugriva led his friends to Kishkindha, and while they remained concealed in a dense wood, he raised the usual war-cry and challenged Vali to combat. He accepted the challenge, fought with his usual bravery, and discomfitted Sugriva, who having had no aid from Rama fled into the Madanga forests. As has already been pointed out Vali was compelled to give up the pursuit, owing to the interdict placed against him to enter it. Rama, Lakshmana and other friends followed Sugriva to the grove. On their approach, he taunted Rama with practising deceit on him, by failing to perform his part of the promise. Rama explained that while the brothers were fighting the duel, he was not able to detect a shade of difference

§ Cantos 9 and 10 Kishkindakandam.
† Vide canto 73 Aranyakandam.
‡ Cantos 2 to 8 Kishkindhakandam.

between them, and he had to therefore refrain from discharging his arrow at Vali for fear of killing him. In order to distinguish one from the other, he directed Lakshmana to throw round the neck of Sugriva a wreath of creepers with crimson flowers on and desired him to go back to Kishkindha and challenge Vali again for combat. While he readily did so, Rama and his brother remained in the sacred grove watching what was going on in the battle-field*. Vali did not hesitate to encounter Sugriva a second time, notwithstanding the entreaties of his chief and favourite queen Tara not to fight his brother on that inauspicious day. He passed out of the portals of his palace and took up the gauntlet. The combat was fought most fiercely, but with varying success till at length Rama observing his friend staggering under the blows of "the conquering foe" laid his hand on his bow strings and aimed his arrow at the breast of Vali It pierced his heart unswervingly and with the arrow implanted in his heart he reeled and fell.†

I have given this account at length as it is not available to the to the ordinary reader. As Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar is anxious to justify the conduct of Rama and Sugriva, he should be in a position to judge for himself. The first and foremost breach of propriety on the part of Sugriva was the desertion of his post. He had the whole kingdom at his back and he was consequently in a position to command all conveniences for staying at the mouth of the cave for any length of time. If he was tired of his duty, he could at least have put some of his trusted followers at the post such as Hanuman, Nala, and Nilan, who later on in the war with Ravana performed great exploits. In the next place, the indecent haste with which he arrived at the conclusion, that his brother was dead, does not prove his *bona fides* He relied upon conjectures rather than satisfying himself with practical proof. His intimate friend and lieutenant Hanuman was known to possess prodigious powers, so that he could assume any shape, attain any speed, and stalk over the sphere—the celestial and nether worlds included. An individual like this could have been sent at the head of a search party, before Sugriva assumed regal powers. Thirdly, his closing the cavern with a huge stone does not demonstrate that he was innocent. That act only goes to show that he did not wish Vali his brother and king to return. Fourthly, his silence was more than criminal. If he had given the necessary information

* Canto 12 Kishkindhakandam.

† Canto 16 Kishkindhakandam.

to those more interested than himself, such as the queens of Vali and his son Angada, they would have set people to look for him. Lastly, even granting that the interests of the kingdom required the presence of a king, his duty was to place his nephew on the throne and act as his guardian or the regent. The will of the people as suggested by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar had nothing to do in a country where the law of primogeniture prevailed, and this fact was admitted to Rama by Sugriva. It was moreover decided by the behest of Rama, to make Angada the heir-apparent to the throne, and Sugriva implicitly obeyed his wishes. The late Mr. Dutt has put the matter most graphically thus:

"Gallant Angada, son of Bali is in regal duties trained
"Ruling partner of thy Empire to be valiant prince ordained
"Eldest son of the eldest brother such the maxim we own
"Worthy of his father's kingdom doth ascend his father's throne."

—Page 3, Dutt's *Ramayana.*

It seems to me that Rama himself felt the justice of his claim, and desired to make amends for the injustice that had been prepetrated. It will be seen from the facts marshalled above that any amount of white-washing of Sugriva, because he was a partisan of the Aryans, will not clear him of his sin, and that when Mr. Dutt said—"Bali was a great king amongst the non-aryans, but Sugriva thirsted after his kingdom." he stated the truth.* Thus the cause espoused by Rama was not a righteous one and he was impelled to act thus by self-interest.

Now we will examine the conduct of Rama, and see how he comes out of the ordeal. When his shaft struck Vali it did not kill him instantly. Before he breathed his last, he had the satisfaction of knowing, who the author of his death was and what justification he had in bringing it about. After Vali was laid prostrate, Rama and Lakshmana approached him, probably with the object of admiring his valour. Addressing them with all respect, he tauntingly enquired what fame they had secured by secretly compassing his death and without openly fighting with him in the field, as a serpent does to death a sleeping man, while he had done them no harm knowingly or unknowingly.†

In reply Rama advanced two grounds viz:—

(1) That the country governed by Vali was subject to the authority of king Bharatha as a descendant of Ikshuvahu, and he (Rama) as his representative was justified in administering condign punishment to

* Vide Ancient Hindu Civilization Vol. 1 p. 141.
† Canto 17 Kishkindhakandam.

him (Vali) for ravishing the wife of his younger brother Sugriva.

(2) That as he (Vali) was an animal, a royal personage such as he was justified in hunting him down. §

With regard to the first, I have taken some trouble to prove that the Ikshuvahu Empire did not extend to Southern India and that such a condition was impossible in the light of the circumstances existing at the time. On this ground the authority of king Bharatha could not have been extended to Kishkindha, and much less could Rama have acted as his representative. In the next place even granting that Bharatha exercised suzerainty over Kishkindha where was the authority on which Rama acted?

(1) As an exile he was a state prisoner, and as such he was debarred from taking part in matters of state. The fact that Rama declined to be present at the coronation of Sugriva, on the ground that he was forbidden by his father to enter any city or country, during the fourteen years of his exile, ¶ confirms the statement.

(2) If Rama had been in a position to receive a mandate of this kind from the Emperor Bharatha, the first thing he would have done would have been to seek his aid in the recovery of Sita.

(3) It is curious that a person who was unable to help himself should interfere in state matters.

Lastly, of the two main arguments advanced by Rama—one cuts the other asunder. For, if Vali could be hunted down as a beast of the field by a Royal sportsman, it would be unfair to enforce the standard of morality maintained in human society amongst quadrupeds.

Vali—The view taken by my friends and myself, after removing the allegorical veil, is that Vali was a powerful Dravidian king, that when he had to leave his kingdom on an expedition of conquest, he left the reins of Government in the hands of Sugriva, but on his return he found him, surrounded by a number of evil advisers refusing to restore the Government of the country. On this he had to fight his brother, kill some of his followers, and send to exile Sugriva and the rest of them. At the same time he detained the wife of Sugriva as a prize of war and was justified by the Code of warfare existing at that time. Here we may cite a modern parallel, in the act of the great Napolean after the battle of Austerlitz. After his fall, Valmiki himself has

§ Canto 18 *Kishkindhakandam.*

¶ Canto 26 *Kishkindhakandam.*

detected in Vali, a great and high-souled king* His great piety is referred to in canto 39 of the Uttarakandam. He was above all a very generous man. For when he banished Sugriva it was quite in his power to have put him to death. But his fraternal love and his usual kindly nature prevented him from taking that extreme step.† Again we find that when his favourite queen Tara counselled him against fighting his brother, and urged him to live in peace with him, he said that he would once more crush Sugriva's pride and thus teach him another lesson, but would not destroy him.‡ To the very last his generous nature would not permit him to think that Rama would be guilty of any iniquity, and that if he did him any harm it would be in fair fight. But such a trait of character appears to be inherent in the family. For during the war between the celestials and the Rakshathas, Malyavan had to point out, the time-honoured morality of the Kshatrias and taunt Narayana thus. 'Like a base wight thou slayest us desisting from fight and exercised with fear."¶

With regard to the observation of Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, that Valmiki did not keep back facts unfavourable to the Aryans, I have only to remark that it is always a difficult task to conceal truth.

Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar has made much of the counsel of Tara. It will be seen from Canto 15 of the Kishkindhakandam that the following were the points urged by Tara against fighting Sugriva on the second occasion.

(1) That the day was inauspicious.

(2) That Rama was invincible in war and saintly in character.

(3) That it was the duty of the elder brother to protect the younger.

There is therefore nothing about the justness of the cause espoused by Rama, unless the inference is drawn from point No. (2) and we have already demonstrated that it was otherwise.

Now I shall deal with Vibhishana. The Aryans have translated him to the position of an Alwar or a saint and counted him amongst the limited members of Siranjeeves or immortals. He is even supposed to rule over Ceylon, of which fact the Brritish Government is not cognizant and I am not aware that they are paying any tribute to him. It does not appear what virtue Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar has detected in him, when he states that he fought strenuously on the side of Rama.

* Canto 17 Kishkindhakandam.
† Canto 24 Kishkindhakándam.
‡ Canto 16 Kishkindhakandam.
¶ Canto 8 Uttarakandam.

But a Dravidian certainly finds in him a most ambitious, ungrateful, unbrotherly and disloyal individual. No doubt he counselled against war, on the ground of overwhelming strength on the Aryan side. There were however others who did the same and yet stood firm by their king, father, brother, Lord, and country. For instance Kumbhakarna, the mightiest of Ravana's brothers, while agreeing with Vibhishana in denouncing the conduct of Ravana in abducting Sita (as given by the Aryan chronicler) was determined to be "true to brother, and to monarch, be he right, be he wrong" and "to fight for Lanka". Mr. Dutt speaking of these brothers in his Ramayana makes the following observations: "It is noticeable that Ravan's second brother Kumbhakarna had the courage to censure his elder's actions. But unlike Vibhishana he was determined to fight for his king, whether he was right or wrong. There is a touch of sublimity in the devoted loyalty of Kumbhakarna."* Though the Ramayana does not state so, it appears to me that Vibhishana was already in communication with the hostile camp to play his act of treachery for the sake of the coveted crown of Ravana. For, this fact is apparent from the abrupt manner in which Vibhishana deserted Ravana with four of his ministers and went over to the enemy; though considerable efforts have been made by the chronicler to show that he was first suspected as a spy and that it was only after considerable deliberation he was admitted into the confidence of Rama and his party.§ After he joined Rama, the greatest service Vibhishana rendered was by informing him from time to time of "the secrets by which each warrior could be killed." To enable him to play his part successfully, with the aid of his intimate knowledge of his kinsmen he watched the movements of every one of them, obtained all useful information, and communicated it to the enemies of his country whenever they stood in need of it. The death of Indrajit for instance—the most tragic of all the incidents in this war—was brought about in this fashion. For he was known to be invincible and he would not have been entrapped had he not been taken by surprise at an unguarded moment by Lakshmana, acting on the information furnished by Vibhishana.† Thus the greatest of traitors, whom every Dravidian that has in him a spark of patriotism ought to execrate, has been raised to the status and dignity of a demigod. In our days we have heard of men selling plans of fortifications and ships of naval warfare to the enemies of their

* Vide Note prefixed to Book IX of Dutt's *Ramayana*, page 127

§ Vide Cantos 17 and 18 Yuddhakandam.

† Vide Cantos 85 to 91 Yuddhakadam, see also Canto 35 of Uttarakandam.

country and how they have been dealt with when found out. In the Rama-Ravana war if the tables had only been turned against the Aryans, the fate of Vibhishana could be easily imagined. At its conclusion, there was the usual mock lamentation on the part of this Judas at the fall of Ravana, but the fact that he assumed purple without loss of time and without trying to place a direct descendant of Ravana on the throne exhibits him in his true light. In the succession to the Dravidian thrones by Sugriva and Vibhishana the standard of political morality set up by the Aryans is illustrated.

Ravana— In regard to the character of Ravana I have not much to add to what I have stated in my first article. Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar has made out a long list of his disqualifications as a man and a king, and of the heinous crimes committed by him. But the readers of the Ramayana are familiar with the austere penance he performed for a great length of time, accompanied with such self-sacrifice as was unknown to the Aryans.* This was at the beginning of his career, but his subsequent life shows that he allowed not a single day to pass without worshipping the Siva-linga with the aid of the choicest flowers and sandal.† His piety is also exemplified by the innumerable hymns he sang and set to music in honour of Siva at Kailas.‡ He was also versed in the foreign lore of the Vedas, Angas and Sastras.§ In addition to music he was also a patron of the other fine arts, as will be seen from the fact that they had attained perfection in his dominions. Certainly the character of the individual who fosters these cannot be depraved. The Ramayana does not speak of any internal troubles in the kingdom, though there were expeditions of conquest beyond its confines and all round the known world. But he lived in peace with his brother Dravidian kings, such as Vali of Kishkindha and Arjuna of Mahismatis on the banks of the Narbada,¶ and his quarrel appears to have been only with the foreigners. I shall not further tire the reader by enumerating his virtues. In short the fear of God, and other concomitant virtues improve the best side of human nature and are inconsistent with the picture drawn of him by his enemies. Once upon a time, a tiger and a man met together to witness a painting, in which a ferocious tiger was represented as being trampled under the foot of a man. The individual referred to

* Canto 32 Aranyakandam and Canto 10 Uttarakandam.

† Canto 36 Aranyakandam.

‡ Canto 16 Uttarakandam.

§ Canto 32 Aranyakandam.

¶ Cantos 37 and 39 *Uttarakandam.*

above naturally addressing the beast taunted it pointing out how a fellow-tiger was being treated by his brother-man. The curt reply the tiger gave was that the picture was drawn by a man. It is necessary to regard the account of Valmiki in the strain of this anecdote. Ravana therefore in the light of the statements of the Aryans themselves, was one of the highest and the noblest specimens of humanity and he was misrepresented with an object. My friend Mr. V. P. Subramonia Mudaliar observes most ingeniously but truly that the unnatural possession of the ten heads and twenty arms by Ravana did not literally mean so but only went to show that he had the best qualities of the head and heart and that foreign jealousy would not permit them to be shown in their true light. It is no wonder therefore that Sita, who fell into the clutches of Ravana as a prisoner of war, was safe in his hands, notwithstanding the fact that he was over head and ears in love with her. It was quite in his power to violate her chastity, but he would not do anything of the kind against her will and pleasure. It was for this reason he laboured directly and through others to win her affection. Canto 31 of the Uttarakandom threatens a curse against him, if ever he dares to violate the modesty of a woman. It seems that this malediction arose out of his unauthorised conduct towards Rambha—the chief of the prostitutes of the dominions of Indra. In the first place, the story is improbable, as she would only have been too glad to secure the love of one who was all-powerful in all the three worlds. In the next place, it was a subterfuge invented by the Aryans to belittle the magnanimity of a great and good man. Lastly, supernaturalism does not find a place in an historical criticism.

There are one or two other points raised by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, respecting the character of Ravana which should not go unchallenged. He says that he was an undutiful son and an unnatural brother‡ referring to his dealings with Kubera. Both were sons of Visrava—the son of Pulasthya, but by different mothers, one the daughter of Baratwaja, and the other of Sumali the Rakshatha. From the birth of time Lanka was the heritage of the Rakshathas, but owing to the insolence offered by them to the Celestials they were driven out of it to the nether world. When Kubera was about to be settled in life, he wanted a place to reside in and Pulasthya, his grandfather, asked him to occupy the deserted city of Lanka.§

‡ Vide page 212 of the M. Q. Review Vol. VIII.

§ Canto 3 Uttarakandam.

While he was in possession of it, Ravana attained to man's estate and his maternal grandfather Sumali instigated him to claim it. On this Kubera consulted their common father Visrava and he advised him to give it up and retire to the side of Kailas. I do not see any impropriety in claiming one's ancestral estate from an usurper; there is nothing unfilial or unbrotherly in doing so. With regard to the Pushpakavimana belonging to Kubera he was deprived of it by Ravana in a fair fight. One day the former sent an insulting message to the latter respecting his conduct towards the celestials. He took umbrage at this, fought with him, and carried away his Pushpakavimana as a trophy of victory.*

The abduction of Sita—Though in order to meet the arguments of my critic I have here and there taken for granted the mythological accounts given by Valmiki, to examine this question impartially, it is necessary that my readers should shake off the halo of divinity that surrounds certain characters and the allegorical veil thrown over certain portions of the Ramayana. It will then be conceded in the first place, that Tadaka was connected with the Royal family of Lanka at least as a member of the Rakshatha race, if she was not even more closely allied and her death therefore by the hand of Rama must have been working in the minds of all prominent Rakshathas, as she was herself a leading member of the community, having been the powerful queen of a Province of India. In the next place, Surpanaka was a princess holding a high status at Dandakaranya and Janasthana. She was married to the king of Danavas, but in a war that ensued between those people and Ravana, he was killed by Ravana himself.† On the complaint of his widowed sister, she was appointed as the Vicerene of the two provinces named above, Kara was nominated as her Prime Minister to carry out her behests and Dushana was deputed at the head 14,000 men to guard her and her kingdom.‡ When there exist chapter and verse for the statement made by me in the very authority on which Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar relied, I cannot conceive how he could convict us of misquotations and claim that the Provinces formed a part of the kingdom of the Ikshvakus. But this is a digression. To resume the thread of the account, Ravana must have felt the mutilation of the features of his unfortunate sister as an insult added to injury. To add to these, the kingdom was laid waste and the garrison of 14,000 picked men was annihilated. Further

* Canto 15 Uttarakandam.
† Canto 23 Uttarakandam.
‡ Vide Canto 29 Uttarakandam.

the enemies of his (Ravan's) country, who were under a ban not to enter it, were encouraged to cross the borders and settle themselves down with impunity. These series of events are sufficient as a *casus belli* and Ravana was therefore justified in retaliating upon Rama by carrying away Sita as I have already stated; conditions of war both in ancient and modern times permitted such a course. To say that all-powerful Ravana went like a thief, when there was no necessity for such a course and that Surpanaka rushed upon Sita at an unguarded moment in order to eat her up are unlikely and incredible stories. When Ravana knew that the flower of his army was destroyed, he would have gone to the scene of the battle with a large reinforcement and not singlehanded. In all probability Rama and Lakshmana were discomfited before Sita was captured and in order to screen a great disgrace, fanciful stories were concocted. In the same way the Royal princess who was ruling over Dandakaranya and and Janasthana could not have gone to snatch away Sita unattended. It is likely that she was in love with Rama and impelled by this she paid a clandestine visit to him and being detected by Sita Lakshmana treated her in the manner described above at her instance. It may be that Rama passed over the matter as a freak on the part of an idiotic craven crone, but the manner in which this refined torture was perpetrated on the person of a woman, shows that the idea could only have emanated from another woman impelled by feelings of fiendish revenge. But whoever may have been their author, such acts of barbarity did not become any polished man, much less Rama, who had put on the garb of the universal avenger of wrongs.

In my first paper I had raised a number of questions which call for historical criticism, but Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar has thought fit to dismiss them with the simple statement that he was not going to criticise the logic and conclusions arrived at by me, as I have already stated. I have referred to the existence of Rakshathas, Asurars, Devas and Vanaras. It requires no long argument to prove that in God's kingdom there was no cataclysm of this kind. Every thing has always been in its normal condition and if there was anything unnatural it was the mind of man that brought about that aberration incited by malice and envy. We will take for instance the Rakshathas and see if such beings as described by Valmiki were ever created. If my readers would take the trouble of referring to Canto 4 of the Uttarakandam of the Ramayana, they would find that in the beginning God created water, and then men to guard it. When he assigned

this duty they said "Rakshanam" we will protect. Thus even according to the mythological accounts of the Aryans, Rakshatha was a man and he was created to be the guardian of property. In Southern India there is a class of stalwart, dark complexioned people called Maravas meaning heroes breathing martial spirit in them, and always in search of adventures and of whom every Dravidian has reasons to feel proud (notwithstanding the bad habits into which some of them have fallen of late). I think it was to them that the early Aryans have referred as Rakshathas. They were either aboriginal inhabitants of the place or the earliest settlers. They not only formed the fighting strength of the early sovereigns, but were also engaged in policing the country in peaceful times besides being rulers of provinces. From a certain noble duty they had to perform and that during nights, the Aryans chose to nickname them and add a reproach to it. All this as well as the assigning of superhuman strength to them was meant to enhance the reputation of the Aryans. For, if it can be said that an ordinary mortal killed in a fair fight a giant of the status of Virathan, who moved about like a fleeting mountain, carrying in his train all kinds of monsters and being decked with garlands of elephants, lions and other animals of the wood without number, strung together by means of serpents of immense size ‡ the credit is all his. In the same way if it is represented that Rama, a child in his teens, fought Tadaka of the description given in Canto 25 of the Balakandam, and that he killed Ravana of the twenty arms, his reputation must spread throughout the world.† In the same way the origin of Asuras and Vanaras who belonged to a prior wave of emigration may be traced; as I have already stated, the Devas and Rishis were only sections of the Aryans who were introduced into the Dravida land. Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar omitted to refer to this subject or ignored it so that an unpleasant truth might not be laid bare before that portion of the public who are held in a spell of ignorance.

In conclusion, I regret that this paper has run out to this inordinate length against my expectations. In performing a duty to the public, for I regard it as such, if I have exceeded the limits of an ordinary magazine article, I have only to crave the indulgence of my readers and in atonement of my sin I make the following summary.

(1) That my paper on the Ramayana was an historical criticism and it did not deal with any faith or attack of any class.

‡ Canto 4 Aranyakandam.
† Vide also Sabha Parva, Mahabbharatha

(2) That the intemperate language in which Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar's review is couched and the introduction of politics into the discussion was uncalled for—particularly in the present unfortunate condition of India.

(3) That the delay in the introduction of Lord Morley's reforms is not due to the conduct of individuals of my stamp, but to the generosity of the British Government, as it took time to consider the best means of avoiding the tyranny to which the other classes have been subjected by the Aryans (excepting the Maharatta Brahamins) for ages.

(4) That the Dravidians belonged to a wave of emigration earlier than that of Aryans and that they had a civilization distinctly their own.

(5) That there is certainly Aryan blood in the Dravidians, while Dravidian blood runs free in the veins of the Aryans.

(6) That the caste system in Southern India was of later introduction than in the north.

(7) That the want of faith in the Ramayana on the part of the late Professor Sundaram Pillai continued to the day of his death.

(8) That the Ikshvahus never exercised imperial authority over the whole India much less over Dandakaranya and Janasthana, which were under the absolute control of Ravana. There is internal evidence in the Ramayana besides extraneous circumstances to prove this fact.

(9) That Tadaka was of the same race as Ravana even if she did not stand in the relationship of a grandmother to him.

(10) That in espousing the cause of Sugriva Rama did not espouse a right cause. Vali was a more virtuous person than his brother.

(11) That both the reasons advanced by Rama for killing Vali from his place of concealment are untenable.

(12) That Vibhishna was the greatest traitor to his country, besides being disloyal and unbrotherly.

(13) That Ravana and his tribe of Rakshathas belonged to the human race and in all probability to the Marava community of the present day, thus forming a section of the Dravidians; and he was the highest and the noblest specimen of humanity.

(14) That the so-called abduction of Sita was only her capture as a prisoner of war and the act of Ravana is justified both by ancient and modern laws of warfare.

T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI.

IDEALS OF THE EAST AND THE WEST.

By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A.

It is but a trite truism to say that social, religious, moral and political ideas and ideals differ with people of different races. Though certain moral and even religious principles are common to the civilized portion of mankind, yet even among them there are points of marked distinction which have created insurmountable barriers. It is the mission of modern civilization gradually to wipe off these distinctions and to assimilate the various races of mankind inhabiting the most distant parts of the world. The poet says that the east is east and the west is west and the twain shall never meet. But the recent history of the Orient appears to give the lie to this poet's prophecy and we see that what has been regarded as impossible is actually taking place, however slowly and imperceptibly. In politics the divine right of kings long recognized in the West has, for the past hundred years and more, lost its hold on the minds of people, and the progress of democracy has either limited the powers of monarchs or made the people themselves the rulers of nations. The East, where kings have always been everything and their subjects nothing, has also caught this modern spirit and liberal and representative institutions are fast coming in vogue. Western political ideals about liberty, rights of subjects and popular control of governments are taking root in the Eastern soil. Japan has transformed herself on the model of the Occident in almost every department of life and the other peoples of the East, India included, are being slowly but surely influenced in a similar manner. Modern industrialism leaves no choice for the Easterner but to follow in the wake of the people of the West, and their rigid conservatism is giving way before the march of Western civilization. In the matter of religion, it is Asia that has been the teacher of Europe and she maintains that high honour even at this day. Christianity was the product of the East and was transplanted in Europe. It took root there, throve luxuriantly and sent its roots in all directions. The religion of Jesus has, no doubt, left its impress on the countries wherever it has travelled, but it will not be deprecating its worth to say that the East still enjoys the proud reputation of being the birthplace of religion and philosophy. It is the fountain-head of spiritual and philosophical ideas which have been scarcely approached by Western

thinkers and sages. People in America have begun to appreciate the Vedanta philosophy. The high flights attained by Indian thinkers have extorted the admiration of Western scholars and attempts are being made even to interpret Christian doctrines on the lines of the Vedanta. The East is thus strongly acting on the West in the matter of religion and there are signs that Indian philosophy will win still greater appreciation in Europe and America as her literature becomes more widely known there. This appreciation will lead to the acceptance and assimilation of Indian ideas and the East and the West will one day shake hands with each other in spiritual harmony.

The mode of dress in vogue among a people is a matter of convenience and the result of climate. The phenomenon may be seen even in India. The Punjabee and the Madrasee are both Indians, and yet what a difference in their modes of dress? Not that such peculiarities are not to be found in Europe. But there the process of assimilation has brought about almost a community of dress and manners among peoples of different nationalities and very few in this country would be able to tell an Englishman from a German. The spare covering of an inhabitant of Southern India has its justification as much as the extra clothing of the Punjabee. Yet Western civilization has brought into India in its wake its mode of dress and it has become fashionable for educated Indians to dress themselves in European style. You cannot tell a Bengalee from a Mahratta except by his peculiar headdress or the want of it rather. The same part of the dress and the colour of the skin betray the Madrasee, if his peculiar intonation has not already done so. Europeanised or Anglicised Indians, not using the term in any deprecating sense, are not nowadays a rare sight in our cities and larger towns. We are fast discarding what we call our national dress, excepting the turban, in favour of European attire and if a member of the past generation were to rise from the ashes, he would find it difficult to recognise his grandson as an Indian. It is not my purpose to consider whether this change is to be welcomed, condemned or ignored. I would simply call attention to the fact of the transformation that is coming over us. Colour of the skin, provincialisms and intonation will remain to remind us of national distinctions, but other peculiarities which nature does not persist in maintaining are bound in time to disappear. England has for a long time borrowed her fashions in dress and her manners from France. The East has similarly begun to adopt the fashions and manners of the West.

Manners, like dress, are made by climate and every people will praise its manners like its country and condemn those of others. National dress is an adaptation to climatic conditions though its details are a matter of convention. "The shuddering tenant of the frigid zone" is covered with fur from top to toe for the same reason that "the naked negro, panting at the line" dispenses with dress almost altogether. The Englishman, to whatever part of the world he may go, carries as it were a bit of England with him and transplants it even in uncongenial soil. Even the European domiciled in the hot climate of India will persist in perspiring in his heavy and close fitting garments instead of taking to the more convenient and cooler cotton fabrics of this country. Perhaps unconsciously he seeks to keep up the prestige of a member of the European community and what with the *punkhas* and the hill stations tries to neutralize the effects of the grilling heat of the scorching plains. But convention in costume and conservatism will have to give way before the forces of climate and convenience. In the meantime we, the children of India, are fast adopting the European mode of dress, in some cases more becoming and in better consonance with ideas of decency, and sometimes in mere meaningless imitation of the *Sahib's* fashion. I have recently noticed in a daily paper of Northern India a controversy as regards the propriety and utility of our ladies wearing European dress and one correspondent gravely remarks that the present mode of our women's dress is the most unsuitable and that the Western model would be the thing for them. Conservative as our women are, even their dress has been undergoing certain modifications which are approved by decency and convenience. What is wanted in my opinion is an evolution and not a revolution in the matt er of dress Such evolution there has been in Indian dress. It is even now in progress, slow and silent but nevertheless sure. Let us not be merely the slaves of fashion and fad but take up whatever is good and becoming and required by our changing environments.

Manners are oftentimes meaningless conventions and one mode is as good as another. There are various ways of greeting, for example, any one of which may do the duty intended for them. You may shake hands or raise your hat or fold your hands together or raise a hand to your head. Uncovering is a sign of respect with the Europeans, covering with the Hindus. Some manners, however, are the product of climatic and other considerations. Dining at a table, instead of on the floor, using spoons and forks or the bare fingers,

and manners of this kind have much to do with ideas of cleanliness, religious scruples, climate. But even here unprecedent changes and innovations are taking place. Old methods are going and new ones coming in vogue. The shakehand is fast becoming popular. Other manners and even customs such as that of sending greetings and presents on the model of Christmas well-wishing are being adopted European manners have sometimes more of elegance and politeness in them which the Indians might imitate with advantage. We may also learn from them the habits of regularity and punctuality. Without being apish, we may pick up some of the useful, graceful and convenient manners of European society.

Mr. Roosevelt, the ex-President of the United States of America, recently delivered a very weighty speech in Paris, in which he passed some scathing criticism on certain aspects of social life in the West. Voluntary sterility has become fashionable in certain higher circles there with the result that the birth-rate in France has been going down. The old Christian idea of family life, the Divine exhortation to multiply and perpetuate the race, the duty of women to bear and bring up children, all these things have a parallel in India. But we are strangers to that chivalry which places the fair sex above the sterner sex in society. Whatever our treatment of women may have been in olden times, during the last many centuries they have been looked upon in India as mere drudges and slaves of man, ministering to his comforts and bowing to his will in each and every matter. Marriage with us is a duty, not a convenience. It is more a religious affair than social. Even to-day among the Hindus the husband is the lord, the god of the wife. He is all in all to her. Though he may be a veritable tyrant she has no escape from the conjugal tie. According to theory and even in practice in ancient times, the Hindu ideal of wifehood was the noblest that can be conceived. In the *Raghuvamsha* Kalidas makes Aja lament the death of his wife Indumati as that of his companion, counsellor and preceptor. But in modern times we have fallen off from this ideal. In a railway compartment or a tramcar very few would ever think of making room for an Indian lady-passenger if there is lack of sufficient accomodation. In similar circumstances, a European gentleman will stand himself and give his own place to a lady. We may borrow some of this chivalry with benefit and there are signs clearly visible that our ideas in this connection are being slowly modified. People in the West have also much to learn from us in our conception of the marital relation-

Mr. Roosevelt has exposed one of the objectionable aspects and developments of Western civilisation. The responsibility to marriage and of children is becoming too onerous there and this requires correction. Marie Corelli, one of the most famous lady novelists of the day in England, has exposed in her excellent works other features of European society. The heroine of her "Thelma," a lady of that very name, exactly corres-ponds to an ideal of an Indian wife and that is the ideal she wants to place before her readers. Thelma's simplicity, her complete reliance and dependence on her husband, her implicit obedience to him, her having no other will than his, the merging of her life and soul into the life and soul of her lord,—all these features belong essentially to an ideal Indian wife. Not that all wives in the West are such as she tries to expose and ridicule nor are all Indian wives Thelmas or Draupadis and Sitas. They are however types and suggest that Eastern and Western ideals and practices need mutual action and reaction to modify them.

The progress of democracy in the West has strengthened the hands of the masses in their struggle against the classes. Modern industrialism is notorious for the most unequal distribution of wealth in Western countries where we witness the phenomenon of a handful of of millionaires rolling in gold side by side with myriads of the proletariat toiling and sweating for a pittance and starving for want of work to do. The monster of socialism has reared his hideous head and is levelling his attacks against wealth and property. Oppression of wealth and jealousy of class are two disturbing factors in Western society. Yet the dignity of man as man is fully recognized, the standard of comfort has greatly risen and every one has the chance of bettering his condition and attaining a higher position in life. In India the brotherhood of man, a characteristic Christian principle, is unknown, the dignity and equality of man are not recognized and the caste system has relegated thousands and thousands of people to a perpetual life of shame, misery and drudgery. But by a contact with the West the Indian conscience is awakening to social injustice and oppression. The lot of the widows has begun to excite sympathy and the depressed classes have found champions of their cause. The rigidity of caste is being broken and a sense of equality between man and man is gradually beginning to prevail. Self-respect, consciousness of one's rights and the recognition of those of others are the fruits of Western education. Religion is being purified, social evils removed and the claims of humanity respected.

I have so far pointed out some outstanding features both of Western and Eastern society. As will have been seen already, my object in doing so has been to show how the weaknesses lurking in the two hemispheres may be removed by adaptation, imitation and assimilation. Though the people of the Orient have much to learn from the Occident, the Westerners may also derive much benefit from studying and adopting some of the Ideals of the East. The world is no longer divided into separate water-tight compartments. The easy communication of modern times has linked together the most distant parts of the world. A better mutual appreciation has thereby become possible. Western people are evincing a greater desire to know the East more intimately while the Easterners are copying the ideals and manners of Europe. The East and the West are powerfully acting and reacting upon each other and the effects of this close contact and collision of ideals are patent to one and all. The British Empire has brought forty millions of people of various creeds and colours together and the peace which has been reigning supreme in this country for nearly a century under British rule as also the many other blessings which have been conferred on us by that rule, have placed a golden opportunity in our way of improving ourselves and raising ourselves in the scale of nations. Our old isolation must go, with it must go also our cramping conservatism and ignorance. European peoples must learn to appreciate the inhabitants of the East and treat them with greater sympahy and good-will. The mutual assimilation of what is best in the East and the West will lead to the good of mankind. The materialism of Europe needs some of Indian spiritualization while the spiritual and dreamy attitude of Indian minds wants to be corrected by materialistic influences of Western civilization. One is the complement of the other and the greatest good is to be obtained by the combination and assimilation of what is best in the two. Narrow isolation, proud exclusiveness and prestige of colour or creed must give way to liberal appreciation, discriminating adaptation and willing coöperation. This is a high ideal but one worthy of being placed before us for the benefit of the whole world. Nature is doing her work, let us help her operation.

V. G. KALE.

THE RAMAYANA AND ITS CRITICS.

BY MR. T. SADASIVA AIYAR, B. A., M. L.

EVERY Tamil poet and sage including the author of *Vettivèrkai* (வெற்றிவேற்கை)has praised Manu's Code as *Manu Neri* (மனு நெறி) and *Manu Níthi* (மனுநீதி) and so on and though, of course, there are bad forgeries and interpolations in it (many of them, as usual, due to the medieval priest-craft) the sweeping condemnation of it as Adharma Sastra by Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai shows his rancour against all the writings of Sanskrit sages and his attitude is in striking contrast to the very judicial pronouncement of our respected countryman Mr. Justice Sankaran Nair in his article in the Sociological Review that the Smrithis of Manu and Yajnavalkya are the products of minds filled with Divine Visions and that it is only later Commentators and Editors who have perverted and mutilated the works of those sages in some portions.

As regards the Ramayana, Mr. Justice Krishnaswamy Aiyar says:—"I do not think it necessary to say one word in commendation, for the Ramayana has permeated the very life of the Indian people. So long as there is a Hindu nation, I am certain that nothing in their literature will live which has not in some way or other been affected by the influence of the Ramayana." It is "the inspiration of the Indian people, and it will live to be the inspiration of the Indian people so long as there is any vestige of life in the Hindu nation."

I do not mean to notice the rejoinder of Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai further, especially as he believes that I criticised his first paper because it was an attack "against my class" (Brahmins by birth) and that I "took up the gauntlet on their behalf" and that my plea of want of time to give my views in as much detail as he is able to do in the hospitable columns of the *Malabar Quarterly Review* was a "subterfuge." Controversy under such circumstances is useless. May the Lord Mahadeva give us his devotees a more charitable frame of mind soon. For, even faith without the saving grace of charity degenerates into bigoted rancour while learning merely increases and justifies the rancour by ingenious and plausible quibbles and theorisings which deceive not only others but oneself also.

Mr. Nanu Pillai's paper in the same March issue of the Review is a sober thoughtful contribution (if I may be permitted to say so).

Of course, I disagree (with great respect) from many of his conclusions, but I am glad to find that the authority of Mr. Dutt (or the Western scholars he follows) does not prevent Mr. Nanu Pillai from recognising that the Ramayana is well-founded on solid facts of History and that the Ramayana is not a cloud-myth or a solar myth. Of course, even Jesus Christ has been denied to be a historical personage and represented to be only a solar or phallic myth by persons more intelligent and eminent than Mr. Dutt, but we, lesser mortals, are not bound to follow all their misdirected ingenuity and scholastic casuistry especially as no two of them agree with each other. Mr. Dutt was a widely-read scholar but his Sanskrit learning (with the greatest respect) was not very deep and as a member of the Brahma Samaj who was much under the influence of Western savants, he tried to cramp Indian chronology into the limits of misunderstood Biblical chronology.

I request Mr. Nanu Pillai not to disbelieve me when I plead want of time for noticing only very shortly what appear to me to be very doubtful statements in his paper. Such a request is usually unnecessary, but after my experience with Mr. Ponnambalam Pillai I am obliged to make it. I may be wrong in many of my statements, but that is, of course, to be expected.

(*a*) Pathala might (geographically) be America, but not Malabar. Pathala existed before the days of Sri Parasu Rama who recovered Malabar from the sea. The Rakshasas were confined to Pathala till Ravana's reign. Ravana got only Lanka as his kingdom and it was only by stealth and unrighteous force combined that he made some of his Rakshasas to harass and make raids on the forest portions of the Empire of Ikshvaku's race. Janaka and other subordinate kings all attended the Emperor Sri Rama's coronation and all (except the Janaka and Kekaya kings whom Dasaratha purposely did not invite) attended the Sabha convened by Dasaratha to consider the contemplated Yuva Rajya coronation of Sri Rama. (Seera Dwaja Janaka, father of Sita, should not be confounded with the original Janaka, son of Nimi, all the progeny of the original Nimi being called Janaka such as Kandikya Janaka, Kesidhwaja Janaka etc.).

(*b*) The statement in Mr. Nanu Pillai's paper that there were from the beginning no inter-marriages between the Brahmins and the Kshathriyas seems again inaccurate. In fact, mention of such marriages is very frequent in the Ramayana, the Bhagavatham and the Bharatham. The maariages contracted by Richeeka Rishi, Jamadagni

Rishi, Yayathi (king), Chyavana Rishi, Kardama Rishi, Rishyasringa Rishi, Soubhari Rishi, and numerous others were such inter-marriages.

(*c*) As regards the statement that the name of Siva is not mentioned in the older portions of the Vedas and is not an Aryan God, I need only refer to the essays of my brother Mr.: Nallaswami Pillai who (to my mind conclusively) proves the contrary. Siva's Prasadam is accepted by all Brahmins; only it ought not to be appropriated before it becomes the Lord's leavings. In the Bhagavatha there is a story of a Brahmin boy getting in that manner the property which belonged to Sri Rudra as the Lord's portion of the sacrifice.

(*d*) Halee Rama of the Maha Bharatha is Bala Rama who had Hala or the Plough as one of his two weapons (the other being the rice-pounding club) and Dasaratha's son Rama is never called Halee.

T. SADASIVA AIYAR.

FLOGGING FOR PRISON OFFENCES IN INDIA.*

BY MR. JOSEPH COLLINSON.

IN our recent correspondence with the India Office respecting the alleged increase of flogging for breaches of discipline in Indian gaols, Lord Morley informed us that the facts were officially admitted, but neither in Lord Morley's letter nor in the previous reply of the Master of Elibank to Sir Henry Cotton's question on the same subject is there any indication as to what cause the increase is due.

In his reply to Sir Henry Cotton, the Master of Elibank went on to say (1) that flogging is very sparingly used as a gaol punishment in India, and (2) is reserved, as in this country, for the most serious offences. As to the first of these assertions, reports show that in the Madras Presidency alone corporal punishment for prison offences has risen from nineteen cases to forty in twelve months. This serious state of affairs was brought before the Council of the Governor of Fort St. George by the Right Hon. Kesava Pillai, and was not denied by the authorities. Secondly, the more serious offences are due apparently to the overcrowded state of the Indian gaols; and the rest of the floggings were mostly inflicted for nothing more serious than inability on the part of the prisoners to turn out sufficient work according to the official requirements. Moreover, in some of the Burmese gaols the flogging of untried prisoners is perfectly legal and far from uncommon, and several judicial sentences have been reversed after the lash has been inflicted.

It is misleading to say that in this country flogging is reserved for the most serious offences. Quite recently I called attention to the case of a convict at Princetown who was flogged for throwing an eight-ounce bread-loaf at a prison warder; and if by "this country" the Master of Elibank (who represents a constituency north of the Tweed) includes Scotland, then I may be forgiven for calling attention to a common fact which he has overlooked, viz., that flogging for prison offences is absolutely forbidden in Scottish local prisons.

The following is a copy of the correspondence which has taken place between the Humanitarian League (Indian Committee) and the Secretary of State for India.

---

* This article first appeared in the *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review* and has now been sent to us by the Honorary Secretary, the Indian Humanitarian Committee, London, for publication in our Review.—Ed., *M. Q. R.*

Humanitarian League, 53, Chancery Lane, W. C.,
May 25, 1909.

The Right Hon. Viscount Morley, Secretary of State for India.—My Lord,—I am desired by my Committee to express their thanks for the prompt action you have taken for mitigating the severity and restricting the practice of corporal punishment under the Indian Whipping Act. At the same time, may I bring to your notice that a serious increase of flogging for prison offences is reported, which seems to demand the immediate attention of the India Office.—I remain, my Lord, yours faithfully, JOSEPH COLLINSON.

Whitehall, London, S. W.,
July 14, 1909.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 25, 1909, in which you draw Viscount Morley's attention to a report that there has been a serious increase of flogging for prison offences in India. In reply, I am to say that the latest statistics so far received in this office (which relate to the year 1907 for most of the Indian provinces, and to 1908 for three only) do not lead His Lordship to conclude that there has been any increase in the number of such punishments which has not been duly noted and considered by the authorities in India.—I am, sir, your obedient servant, COLIN G. CAMPBELL.

Joseph Collinson, Esq.,
Humanitarian League.

Humanitarian League, 53, Chancery Lane, W. C.,
July 23.

The Right Hon. Viscount Morley, Secretary of State for India.—My Lord,—I beg to thank you for your letter, and am desired to express the hope of my Committee that, in view of the official admission concerning the increase of flogging for breaches of prison discipline which, as we believe. is due in some instances to overcrowding, and in others to the fact of the prisoners not turning out sufficient work you will urge upon the Government of India the desirability of using its administrative powers to remedy so grave an evil.—I remain, my Lord, yours faithfully, JOSEPH COLLINSON.

THE NAUTCH GIRL.

By Mr. T. S. Rama Sastri.

"How often we are reminded what a poor weak creature man is after all! Not only is he hardly intelligent, but he is hardly conscious. He is always seeing what he *ought* to be doing, and *not* doing it, simply because it is his nature to be inert and do nothing." If talk alone could make a nation great India might have been by this time one of the foremost nations on the face of the earth Editors devote columns for the discussion of this and that reform, and speakers often hurl at one another violent criticisms, but all discussions seem to eventually end in smoke, and nothing practical is done. India is in the meanwhile not a bit better and sleeps on in her wonted mood of fatalistic indifference, apparently unaffected by the toil and turmoil around.

It is admitted by a majority of educated Indians that the nautch is a moral plague-spot on India and a disgrace to her ancient traditions and high ethical civilisation. There was a time when the nautch girl was a respected and respectable being. She was a "devadasi" dedicated to the service of some temple, and led a life of devotion and purity. But she soon changed her character. Forced to live single for all her life, the nautch girl who went to worship learnt to prostitute. It is not all who can appreciate the charms of "single blessedness," and it is but natural that the nautch girl compelled, to live the life of a nun by no choice or desire of her own and surrounded on all sides by temptation, should fall a victim to immorality. Whatever might be the cause for her degradation, we find her now to be nothing more or less than a chartered prostitute. Music and dance are only secondary qualifications which she may learn and become proficient in, to attract more customers to her shop.

The measures adopted by our social reformers have so far been only negative and self-defensive. The Anti-Nautch Movement, which has unfortunately been largely misunderstood and misrepresented to be a cruel and meaningless crusade against music, is purely negative and one-sided in its character. It has recognised the fact that of the two parties necessary for every act of prostitution, if one withdraws, the other must inevitably cease the act, and preaches that you should refrain yourself from attending nautch parties, thinking that your absence will be a sort of discouragement to the nautch

girl and a silent protest against her profession. The Anti-Nautch Movement is no doubt a laudable one but being merely negative and one-sided it becomes a "lever without a fulcrum," and is unable to combat the evil which it wants to eradicate.

It is impossible to expect the nautch girl to abandon her profession and turn to other ways of livelihood, so long as we are unable to show her those other ways. It is futile to ask her to be merely a songstress and not a prostitute.

Education has in many cases induced the nautch girl to become respectable. It is a common practice in this Presidency to admit the daughters of the nautch girl into ordinary girls' schools and teach them along with family girls. This I think is objectionable in two ways. Firstly, the kind of education that is given to family girls in ordinary girl-schools is not strong enough to induce nautch-girls to turn to better ways of life; secondly, a nautch girl is an object-lesson of immorality and ought not to be allowed to mix freely with family girls. It is necessary that separate schools should be opened where the daughters of the dancing girl class should be given education, more ethical and less literary in its character. Education of the male members of a dancing girl's family is more effective than the education of the girls. As it is, these men are mostly drunkards and rascals taught merely to serve and depend upon their sisters. There have been cases of men belonging to the dancing girl class who have received high education and then seeing the heinousness of the profession their sisters followed, have put a stop to their old practices.

Marriage is another way of inducing the nautch girl to abandon her profession. Give the dancing girl a husband and it is not likely she will become immoral. There are also cases of women of the dancing girl class who have married and have since then become quite respectable.

The practice of dedicating girls to Gods is still continued in many places. It was extensive in the Bombay Presidency and the Government there have attempted to suppress it by state legislation. The evil is not so wide-spread in this Presidency. But as it is not entirely absent the Madras Government also may begin to follow the example set by Bombay and punish people for dedicating girls to Gods. The co-operation of the Government is necessary to suppress the evil, though it cannot be denied that "it is a monumental shame to the Hindus that in these days of so-called advanced nationalism Government interference should be necessary for uprooting social and religious

evils. It is a shame to a nation that talks of boycotting the Government, but cannot boycott the heinous vices that pollute even their religious institutions. Temple Hinduism wherever it stands associated with such like vices is a monstrous disgrace to the honoured Hindu name. And if the self-respecting Hindus must needs boycott anything they must boycott first the *Pandas* or more analytically speaking the pious *Gandas* rotting in Hindu temples; and if in spite of all the existing evils they pay tribute to hypocrisy for fear of social persecution and thereby indirectly encourage the vices, they shall be regarded by posterity as abettors of social sins and crimes, and on them will fall the curses of all virgin girls who are forced to the life of prostitution through the positive influence of their greedy hierarchy which feed fat on their blood to the utter pollution of the glorious name of their ancestors, the seers and sages of Arya India."

T. S. RAMA SASTRI.

THE LAW OF KARMA—II.

By Prof. S. A. Desai, M. A., LL. B.

III.

HAVING thus defined the Law of Karma, let us now proceed briefly to consider the objections that have been brought against it, in order that we may understand that Law better and more clearly.

The first of these objections is that the Law of Karma, so far as it presupposes previous lives, is opposed to the Christian doctrine that every human soul was created by God for the first time at the beginning of that soul's present life. Now in the first place, we need not trouble ourselves about this objection. For a doctrine may be opposed to a Christian dogma and yet may be true. But in the second place, is there any thing which necessitates the Christian belief, that every human soul was created by God for the first time at the beginning of that soul's present life? Perhaps a reason, justifying this belief, may be inferred from the following stanzas taken from Tennyson.

"The baby new to earth and sky,
What time his tender palm is prest
Against the circle of the breast;
Has never thought that "this is I";

But as he grows he gathers much,
And learns the use of "I" and "we",
And finds "I am not what I see,
And other than things I touch."

So rounds he to a separate mind,
From whence clear memory may begin,
As through the frame that binds him in
His isolation grows defined.

This use may lie in blood and breath,
Which else were fruitless of their due,
Had man to learn himself anew
Beyond the second birth of death.

—*In Memoriam*, XLV.

The substance of these stanzas is that when a human being is born in this world some time is passed before he learns to know himself as distinct from the world, and the world as distinct from himself and to remember what he gradually learns. Now all this time spent in acquiring self-consciousness and memory would have been wasted if, in the next life, the soul would have to go over again through the

whole process of acquiring self-consciousness and memory. Hence Tennyson concludes that the soul after death remembers itself and its past life on earth. Those, who accept this line of argument, may say that since in this life the human soul does not remember his past life, and has to spend time and energy in learning self-consciousness and memory ; therefore this life of the soul must be its first life. But it is easy to see that this line of argument does not prove anything. For there is *at least apparently* so much waste of time and energy in this world, that the above argument ceases to have any value. Besides may not the same reason account for want of memory of past lives on our part, by which as Tennyson says, some thinkers account for the want of power on the part of the dead to rise again as if they were never dead? For they ask which of the dead would like (e. g.) to see their brides in other hands. So the poet concludes that the rise of the dead but "yet-loved sire would make confusion worse than death, and shake the pillars of domestic peace". *(In Memoriam, XC.)* May not still worse confusion follow from our remembering our past lives, supposing we loved such lives? In the third place, if,—as many eminent Christian thinkers, poets and philosophers hold and emphatically maintain—the progress of man in future is to be eternal, to achieve which each man will have to live infinite lives and each of these lives is to be the outcome of previous lives, is it not reasonable to hold, as the Vedanti does, that a man, as he is born even in this life, is what he has been made by his past lives? Nay, if God is just, then this seems to be the only hypothesis, yet put forth, which satisfactorily explains the immense differences that exist between different human beings from their very birth.

Another objection that is usually brought against the Law of Karma is that it leaves no room for the exercise of the Grace of God. But all that used be said here, in answer to this objection, is that, since the Law of Karma is the expression of the perfect justice of God, and since no other attribute of God and, therefore his Grace can be opposed to, or inconsistent with the perfect justice of God, the Vedanta holds that the Law of Karma cannot be opposed to, or inconsistent with the Law of God's Grace, or conversely, we may say that any doctrine about the Grace of God which is opposed to, or inconsistent with the Law of Karma, must be wrong. As to how the Vedanta reconciles the Law of Karma with the Law of Grace, that is a different question and does not come in here.

A third objection brought against the Law of Karma is that a belief in that Law must cause the believer to feel utter depression and despair as to his future. Now so far as the Law of Karma simply teaches that what we are now is the result of what we have been in the past, and that what we shall be in future will be the result of what we are now; so far as the Law of Karma teaches only this, a firm belief in it, instead of being a source of depression and despair, ought to be one of the most efficient forces, that prompt and inspire a man to put forth the best of his efforts in pursuit of his ideal, whatever that ideal may be.

In order to be fair to those, who bring this objection against the Law of Karma, it must be observed that they bring this objection, not so much against the above mentioned aspect of the Law of Karma, but against another aspect of that Law, expressed, for instance, in the passage:—" That each man, that now exists, has had innumerable lives in the past; and that in each of those lives, he must have done innumerable works. And these works, therefore, have got accumulated." Now just as in each of the previous lives, he did new works; so in each of them he experienced the fruit of, and so exhausted, some of the past works. Still, even if allowance be made for all these works, the fruit of which has been experienced, still in the case of each man, the past accumulation of works is nothing less than infinite. Hence in order to exhaust them, an infinite number of lives must be lived, even supposing (that is impossible) that during none of these lives, he does new works which would lead to the production of further fruit, and therefore a new life. According to this aspect of the Law of Karma, therefore, it would seem that it is not possible for any human being, now living, to free himself from birth and death. It is this aspect of the Law of Karma which is supposed by critics of the Vedanta to be the source of utter despair. Thus one of these critics says:—" The spirit can bear the thought of a decision of its destiny once for all, determined for all eternity; but the endless migration from world to world, from existence to existence, the endlessness of the struggle against the pallid power of that ever-recurring destruction a thought like this might well fill the heart even of the brave with a shudder at the restlessness of all this mending course of things."*

Now in the first place, even this aspect of the Law of Karma can not have any depressing influence upon those who believe in it, so far as they expect that as they pass from world to world, from

* Dr. Oldenberg's *Buddha*, p. 45.

existence to existence, they would get what they think desirable. For instance, why should such people, as are described in certain passages* in the Gita, be depressed by the thought that they have to pass from life to life without an end? If any thing would depress them, it is not the thought of having to live future lives, but to have to leave, at death, the field of their achievements and what they have achieved in this life. And if any thing can reconcile them to death, it is the firm belief that after death they can have other lives in which they will live in the same way in which they are living here on earth. Similarly is it possible that such men, as are described in certain other passages‡ in the Gita, will be depressed at the thought of having to pass from life to life? On the contrary, may not the prospect of life after life, in each of which they may enjoy Dêva bôga, have the very opposite effect on them?

So taking any society of any time, we shall find that no members of it, who come under the technical description of *Tamas* and *Rajas* will be in any way depressed at the thought of having to pass from life to life. And these people must form the vast majority of any society. So, if this aspect of the Law of Karma is to produce a depressing influence on any body, he must believe in the Law of Karma and must be one of the *Satviks*. But even all *Satviks* will not necessarily be depressed by a belief in this aspect of the Law of Karma. For we know, as a matter of absolute certainty, that a man, like Tukaram, instead of being depressed at the thought of having to pass from life to life, actually used to pray to God, at one period of his life, that he should be allowed to lead life after life. For, according to him, that was the only means of doing what he desired to do, i. e., the *bhakti* of God. Again, who will dare say that the teaching of Robert Browning is depressing even to a *Satvik*? Yet according to his teaching, each man must pass from existence to existence literally without an end, in order to secure step by step the highest goal of human life.

It must be admitted, then, that even this aspect of the Law of Karma is not open to the objection, which we have been considering. The fact is that this aspect of the Law of Karma is or will be a source of depression and despair only when the believers in that Law come to look upon all temporal existence as such, here or hereafter, as an evil and find no means to get rid of it. Of course, there came a time, during the development of the Vaidic religious thought, when

* Bhagavadgita, XVI, 13-14.

‡ Bhagavadgita, II, 42; VII, 20; IX, 20.

our ancestors, while they believed in the Law of Karma in all its aspects, came to regard all temporal existence as such as an evil. But when they came to regard all temporal existence as an evil, they succeeded in discovering another Law which, if obeyed, could wholly and once for all counteract this aspect of the Law of Karma even within the brief span of this life. This was what may be called the Law of Grace or *Iswaraprasada.* But with this latter Law we are not concerned in this paper.

So, it may be asserted without the least fear of contradiction, that none of the objections above mentioned can reasonably be brought against the Law of Karma, as understood by and forming an integral part of the Vedanta. But we must consider two or three more objections that are, or might be brought against it. One of these objections is that it would bring no consolation for a man who is suffering from grief, disease, poverty &c., to be told that his suffering is due to his own past deeds. Most probably it would not. But that does not prove that the Law of Karma is wrong; all that it may prove is simply that it is of no use in bringing consolation to a man in distress. But, in spite of that, his distress may be due to his past deeds. But even in such cases, belief in this Law of Karma may be of immense use in as much as a man who believes in it, i. e., a man who believes that he himself has brought on his distress, will not complain about it, but suffer it patiently.

Another objection which is brought against the Law of Karma is that this law cannot be true; because God would not punish us for our past deeds unless he let us know what those deeds were. For it is said, even human justice requires that the accused should be properly informed of the offence with which he is charged. But this objection is mostly due to a confusion between human justice and divine justice. For in the first place, the judge presiding over a Court of Law, being human and finite in all his powers, cannot judge properly even within his limited capacity, unless he listens to all that the accused has to say in answer to the charge that is brought against him. And the accused cannot answer the charge brought against him unless he knows what the charge is. Hence one of the most fundamental conditions of human justice is that the accused should be definitely informed of the charge brought against him. But the judge who, according to the Law of Karma, passes judgments upon our lives and executes them, is believed to be all-wise and all-knowing and therefore, it is not necessary that he should inform us of the

ill-deeds for which we are made to suffer. Having, therefore, implicit and absolute trust in the infinite wisdom, perfect knowledge, and absolute justice of God, the Vedanta, instead of requiring God to let us know our ill-deeds before making us suffer for them, teaches us to infer the quality of our past life by the condition in which we are placed by God in this life. Thus we read:—"All embodied beings, from man to Brahma, enjoy different degrees of happiness. And from these different degrees of happiness are inferred the different degrees of their religious merit." Similarly, "all beings from top to bottom are subject to suffering different degrees of pain. From these different degrees of pain suffered by them are inferred the different degrees of their past Adharma." It is easy to see that just as the Law of Karma embodies the absolute justice of God, the view embodied in this passage expresses the undoubted trust of the Vedanta in the absolute justice of God.

IV.

This, however, is made the basis of a new and apparently more serious objection against the Law of Karma. For, it is argued that if the pain, in the widest sense, which any man suffers in this life, is the proper punishment which God has justly inflicted on him for his past evil deeds; then it would be wrong as well as useless for us even to try to lessen his pain or to relieve him from it. For that would be interfering in vain with the execution of God's justice. Dr. Rowe, one of the most eminent of living American thinkers, expresses this objection as follows:—"Admit that here or in former ages the free deed of every present sufferer earned as its penalty every ill, physical or moral, that appears as besetting just this sufferer today. Admit that and what logically follows? It follows, so I must insist, that the moral world itself, which this free-will theory of the source of evil was to save, is destroyed in its very heart and centre. For consider, A suffers ill. B sees A suffering. Can B, the on-looker, help his suffering neighbour A? Can he comfort him in any true way? No, a miserable comforter must B prove...so long as B, believing in our present hypothesis, clings strictly to the logic of this abstract free-will explanation of the origin of evil. To A he says: 'Well, you suffer for your own ill-doing. I, therefore, simply cannot relieve you. This is God's world of justice. If I tried to hinder God's justice from working in your case, I should at best only postpone your evil day. It would come, for God is just. You are hungry, thirsty, naked, sick, in prison. What can I do about it? All this is your own deed come

back to you. God himself, although justly punishing, is not the author of this evil. You are the sole originator of the ill.' 'Ah!' So A may cry out; 'but can you not give me light, insight, instruction, sympathy? Can you not at least teach me to become good?' 'No,' B must reply; 'No, if you deserved light or any other comfort, God, being just, would enlighten you himself, even if I absolutely refused. But if you do not deserve light, I should preach to you in vain, for God's justice would harden your hearts against any such good fortune as I could offer you from without, even if I spoke with the tongues of men and of angels." (*Studies of Good and Evil, Pp.* 11-13).

It will be seen that this objection, if it really applies to the Law of Karma, as understood by the Vedanta would be most fatal to the whole teaching of the Vedanta; for it would make all attempts at self-improvement or the improvement of others not only useless but sinful. We cannot however consider this objection unless we take into consideration what was called above the Law of Grace as taught by the Vedanta. And as there is no room in this paper to consider that Law, we must leave aside the above objection against the Law of Karma. It must, however, be observed that the Law of Karma, as understood and taught by the Vedanta, leaves ample room for efforts at self-improvement and at the improvement of others.

Here, however, we meet with the last and the most formidable objection against the Law of Karma. This objection is that the Law of Karma, if true, leaves no room for what is called the freedom of the will, and, therefore, for any effort either for self-improvement or for the improvement of others. For it is said, if what I shall be is to be determined by what I am, do, and experience now; and what I am, do and experience now is determined by what I was, did, and experienced in the past; then whatever freedom of the will I might have had at the beginning, now I am a plaything, as it were, in the hands of my past, and therefore have no power to determine my future as I think fit.

In order to be able to answer this objection against the Law of Karma, let us first see what is there in the teaching of this Law which seems to support this objection. We saw above Shankaracharya arguing that according to the Vedanta Ishwar creates each being according to the previous Karma of that being. This same view is expressed in the following Slokas in the Gita:—"Those in whom *Satvaguna* predominates at death, are next born as Devas; those in whom *Rajôguna* predominates at death, are next born as human

beings; and those in whom *Tamôguna* predominates at death, are next born as lower animals." ¶ Further, "those who are born as human beings are born either as Brahmanas, Kshatryas, Vaisyas and Sudras according to their *Guna Karma*". †

The view contained in the Slokas ‡ as explained by Shankaracharya, is that every human being is born with a particular *Svabhava* which is determined by, or which was the effect of, a part of his past lives. This *Svabhava* is manifested by the predominence of certain *gunas* corresponding to *Satwa*, *Raja* and *Tama* and God has divided the duties or works to be done by human beings according to these *gunas* flowing from their *Svabhava*. The duties or works thus corresponding to the *Svabhava* of each man are called his *Svadharma*, *Sahajakarma* or *Svabhavajakarma*. And it is maintained by the Vedanta that these duties or works, corresponding to the *Svabhava* of a man, are unavoidable by him. He will be compelled to do them even against his will. "If entertaining egotism you think that you may not fight, vain, indeed is that resolution of yours. Nature will constrain you. That, O Son of Kunti! which through delusion you do not wish to do, you will do involuntarily tied down by your own duty flowing from your nature.*

But, if a man must do his *Svakarma*—if he cannot avoid it—and if his *Svakarma* is determined by his *Svabhava* which is determined by his past; then what freedom has he to determine his future, for that is said to be determined by his present life? In considering this question, we must first notice that even granting that, according to this Vedanta view no freedom is left to a man as to whether to do his *Svakarma* or not; still it may be maintained that he is free as to doing or not doing what are called *Kâmya* Karmas and *Nishiddha* Karmas i.e., as to doing or not doing those Karmas which are done with a special end in view and those Karmas that are bad and are, therefore, forbidden. For, in the first place, the above slokas do not refer to such Karmas, but only to *Nyatha* or *Svabhavaja* Karmas; and in the second, the Vedanta teaches, with the greatest emphasis and insistence that a man, desirous of the highest goal, ought not to do either *Nishiddha* or *Kamya* Karmas.

¶ Bhagavadgita XIV. 14-15.

† Bhagavadgita IV, 13.

‡ Bhagavadgita XVIII, 41-44. It is necessary to observe that I have here given Shankaracharya's explanations of this and other passages. not because they are necessarily the correct explanations, but because these explanations seem most to support the objection against the Law of Karma, we are considering.

* Bhagavadgita XVIII 59-60. (Telan's Trans.)

But it may be alleged that, even with respect to these two kinds of Karmas, the Vedanta leaves no room for the freedom of the will. For the Gita expressly says:—"Being deprived of their knowledge by various desires, and being controlled by their own Prakriti men devote themselves to the lower deities by way of observing various regulations."§ The explanation of the phrase *Prakritya Nyathakah Svaya* by Shankaracharya proves that according to the Vedanta even in doing *Kamya* Karmas, men are determined by their *Svabhava.* So also in another place, the Gita says:— "Even a wise man acts according to his Svabhava. All beings follow their Svabhava, what can control do?" ‡ Shankaracharaya has explained this Sloka as follows:—If it be asked, why do men not obey God's commands, how are they not afraid of the punishment that must follow the transgression of God's teaching? The answer is that every one,—whether wise or foolish—acts according to his Svabhavam which is the result of his deeds in former lives. No restraint, even imposed by God, can be of any use.

It may be alleged, on these two, and such other slokas, that man according to the Law of Karma, taught by the Vedanta has no freedom even as to *Kamya* or *Nishiddha* Karmas. That this view is plausible is evident from the fact that Shankaracharya himself has raised this objection and shown that it is groundless. For, as an introduction to the sloka, which follows the last quoted above, he says:—"Since all beings act in conformity with their *Svabhava*, and no being is without *Svabhava*; therefore it may be concluded that, there being no room for the possibility of efforts on the part of man, all the teaching of Sastra is useless." To show that this conclusion is not right the next sloka is added. This sloka * is as follows:—"Every sense has its natural likes and dislikes fixed for fixed objects. A man should not yield to these likes and dislikes. For they, if he yields to them, carry him astray." Shankaracharya has explained this sloka as follows:—"All the senses have these likes and dislikes fixed respectively for objects which are favourable and unfavourable to them. This being so we may point out the room for the possibility of man's efforts and the utility of the teaching of Sastra by saying that a man, who wishes to live in conformity with the teaching of Sastra, ought not to yield to the likes and dislikes for objects which are natural to the

§ Bhagavadgita VII, 20.
‡ Bhagavadgita III, 33.
* Bhagavadgita III, 34.

senses. For the *Svabhava* of any man controls him to act in conformity with it only through the likes and dislikes of the senses. It is when it succeeds in doing so, the man does not do what he ought to do, and does do what he ought not to do, when, however, instead of yielding to them, a man, controls them; then he is able to live in conformity with the teaching of Sastra and is not led astray by his *Svabhava*. Therefore, a man ought not to allow himself to be controlled by the likes and dislikes of the senses. For they are, as it were, the robbers who beset his path to Paramartha."

From this Sloka, as interpreted by Shankaracharya, we learn what may be regarded as an essential modification of the Law of Karma. For now we learn that though the *Svabhava* with which a man is born is the result of his past deeds, though according to that *Svabhava* his senses, &c., have natural likes and dislikes for objects, and though as soon as his senses come in contact with those objects, those likes and dislikes will be produced; though a man has no freedom or power *so far as this goes*; still he has the power to resist the temptations caused by these likes and dislikes. Of course if he does not exercise this power of resistance, but yields to them; then the acts corresponding to those likes and dislikes, will necessarily take place. He cannot then help it. It is in this sense that the Vedanta says, in slokas like the following, that it is the Prakriti that is the cause of the acts a man is said to do. "He whose mind is deluded by egoism thinks himself the doer of the actions, which, in every way, are done by the qualities of nature." * "When a right-seeing person sees none but the qualities (to be) the doers (of all action), and knows what is above the qualities, he enters into my essence."† "The man of devotion, who knows the truth, thinks he does nothing at all, when he sees, hears, touches, smells, eats, moves, sleeps, breathes, talks, throws out, takes, opens or closes the eyelids; he holds that the senses deal with the objects of the senses." § Though, however, the Vedanta thus teaches that an act, that is the whole process beginning with the tendency for likes and dislikes for objects which the senses naturally possess, and ending with the actual external deed, all this is due to Prakriti; still the man, i.e., the human soul, is responsible for the deed with all its consequences if instead of resisting the temptation corresponding to the likes or dislikes of the senses, allowed itself to be led away by them. And it is plain that, since all *Nishiddha* and

* Bhagavadgita III, 27. (Telang's Trans.)
† Bhagavadgita XIV, 19.
§ Bhagavadgita V, 8-9.

Kamya Karmas are due to these likes and dislikes; if a man develops and exercises his power to resist the likes and dislikes of the senses, he can succeed in avoiding all acts of these two kinds.

It must be admitted, therefore, that the Law of Karma as interpreted by the Vedanta leaves complete Freedom of Will to every man so far as the *Kamya* and *Nishiddha* Karmas are concerned. So, the only question, that now remains, is, whether it leaves room for the freedom of the will so far as the *Nyatha* Karmas are concerned? Now, to be brief, if any body says that the freedom of will requires that a man should have the power to avoid all acts which are his *Nyatha* Karmas, as he has the power to avoid *Kamya* and *Nishiddha* Karmas, then it must be admitted that according to the Vedanta, no man possesses this power. But if, freedom of will in this case, simply refers to the doing or not doing of any given particular *Nyatha* Karma, as for instance Arjuna's *Nyatha* karma or duty to fight with the Kauravas, then the Vedanta admits that every man possesses this freedom; it only says that if a man like Arjuna having the *Svabhava* of a Kshatrya were to avoid the doing of one act which is due to *Dêjas* or *Sourya* and which mainfests *Dêjas* or *Sonraya*, he will have to do some other act coming under the same category. And this is the meaning of the slokas already quoted, which are likely to be regarded as leaving no freedom to man as regards his *Svabhavaja* Karma.† And because this is the proper interpretation of these slokas, that is because, according to the Vedanta, a man cannot help doing some acts which are determined by his *Svabhava* though it is in his power to avoid the doing of any given act which is determined by his *Svabhava*, therefore the Vedanta is never weary of insisting that a man ought to do every one of his *Nyatha* acts, and ought not to omit any one of them.

But it may now be asked if the Law of Karma compels a man to do some acts which are in conformity with his *Svabhava* which is the result of his past life and which hé cannot change so far as this life is concerned; does not the Law of Karma deprive a man of freedom to this extent at least? The answer is that the Law of Karma, as forming an integral part of the teaching of the Vedanta, does deprive a man of freedom to that extent; but it must be added at once, that it does so, for the sake of his own highest good or to express the same thing in another way, if, according to the Vedanta, Ishwara, as the executor of the Law of Karma, deprives a man of his freedom to do what he

† *Bhagavadgita XVIII*, 59-60.

likes *to the extent mentioned;* then according to the Vedanta, this deprivation itself is a part of the manifestation of the grace of Ishwara or Ishwaraprada (*e. g.* see Gita XVIII, 45-46). But to make this clear we shall have to study what may be called the Law of Ishwaraprasada which it is not intended to do in this paper.

Having thus considered the Law of Karma, as an integral part of the teaching of the Vedanta, except so far as it is mixed up with the Law of Ishwaraprasada, the task, set for this paper, is completed; and so I beg to take the readers' leave.

PROF. S. A. DESAI.

ORGANIZATION.

BY THE EDITOR.

OF the two Primary requisites of Nation-building, Patriotism and Organization, we have treated of Patriotism in a previous article and have seen therein how a true and rational type of that feeling, as distinguished from the false and irrational or the jingoistic brand, serves as *the* motive force in any national undertaking whatsoever. Here we shall take up Organization, the other requisite, for our consideration.

Organization is a term for which we are indebted to Biology. It is in beings endowed with life that we see organs or parts discharging special functions and thereby contributing their share to the maintenance of the life or the well-being of the whole Organism. Each cell, or each colony of cells, has its own individual life, but what is more important from our standpoint, also furnishes its quota to the corporate life it enjoys in common with the other cells or cell-colonies. Life of an Organism is thus distinguishable from the life of a cell, in that the former, unlike the latter, is the result of co-operation among cells or cell-colonies of various kinds. And how is this co-operation brought about? Doubtless by means of the intimate organic connections existing between the various parts of the Organism, which is on that account described as 'Organized' or as being in a state known as 'Organization'.

To pass from Biology to Sociology, from a view of individual Organism to that of Social Organism, involves no leap and is quite a natural transition. Organization, in a sociological sense, means the creation and maintenance, in due relationship of interdependence, of such social bodies, instruments or institutions as will perform special functions for the existence or the well-being of the whole society. It is the state of perfect preparedness of a people or nation for the efficient discharge of all its public duties. Every form of Social Organization, therefore, presupposes three essential conditions viz.,—(i) that the social institution should have a *special function* to discharge which other social institutions cannot discharge or can discharge but imperfectly, (ii) that the special function performed should be useful for the *existence* or the *well-being* of society, and (iii) that the existence or well-being should be of the *whole society or of a considerable or even an appreciable section* of it and not merely of its individual parts taken separately.

They may be briefly described as the speciality of function, the utility of function and the community* of function. If a social institution does not satisfy all the three foregoing conditions, it hardly deserves to be styled a limb in a Social Organization. For instance, a social institution which does not perform a special function, or performs it in a manner not conducive to the existence or well-being of society, or if conducive so as not to affect the whole or a considerable or an appreciable part of it, such a social institution cannot be counted as an organic part in a Social Organization. It is also quite natural that what was once an organic part may, by later corruptions, become foreign to the 'body social'. Failure in the speciality of function will make the existence of the particular institution superfluous. As an example, we may name many a caste which has lost its speciality of function and therefore 'lags superfluous on the stage'. Failure in the utility of function will render the institution inane. The various religious *mutts* of Southern India, which have lost their touch with the people and which practically turn out no religious work whatever, may be cited as a glaring instance of this failure. Last of all, failure in the community of function will transform the institution into purely an individualistic one instead of being sociological. Examples of this are numerous and will readily occur to our readers themselves.

Taking then the social institutions which satisfy the three conditions mentioned above, we have, first of all, to see what line of development they have followed. Do these institutions exhibit distinct stages in their historical evolution or at least fall under well-marked groups? It requires, we think, no great acquaintance with sociological phenomena for one to see that the various groups of existing human society bear still signs of stratification as distinct and well-marked as those of the earth on which they live. The purely political institutions, which lie at the top and are the most advanced of the social phenomena, form a layer by themselves and can scarcely be confused with those domestic or family institutions which were the earliest and the most rudimentary formation of society. Between these two extreme groups of social phenomena is interposed a very large class of institutions, which collectively goes by the name of 'communal' 'tribal', or even by the name 'social' by way of pre-eminence. These intermediate institutions are more advanced than the domestic, though not so advanced as

*The term is here used not in the sense that the other parts of the 'body social' help towards the discharge of the particular function of a particular institution, though that is also true to some extent, but in the sense that they share in the benefits of such discharge.

the political; in a manner they partake of a semi-political nature. Comparing the functions of these three classes of institutions with one another, we shall see that the functions discharged by the family Organizations are only a trifle removed from the self-regarding functions of the individual, that the communal duties are more 'social' and less self-regarding than the domestic, and that the political functions refer purely to 'social' or 'public' matters. Broadly distinguished, the domestic and the communal or social Organizations work directly for the individual and if at all indirectly for the society, while the political Organizations work directly for the society and only indirectly for the individual. To illustrate by typical examples the three phases of social evolution pointed out above it is enough if we name the Marriage, the Trade and the Legislative institutions. The issue raised by Sir H. S. Maine whether the individual as a separate unit was evolved out of an antecedent family Organization or whether the family Organization itself developed out of a prior state of independently existing units does not concern us here; for obviously an individual as an individual has no place while treating of *social institutions.* Nor are we required to advert to the universally received dictum that the ancient states, the parent-stock from which the present-day political societies have sprung, were used to assume all the powers under the sun and engaged themselves in regulating what are now admitted on all hands as purely domestic concerns. It is enough if we bear in mind that the three stages of social evolution, though absolute in their chronological succession, have never been so distinct as not to overlap one another. As even now we have startling instances of a state overstepping its bounds and indulging in the luxury of social legislation, so we have had also communal even political Organizations legislating for the domestic matters of individuals. These misconceptions and aberrations seem quite natural and it is equally natural that they should in time die and 'leave not a wrack behind'. From the tenor and trend of past events one could confidently predict that the functions of our political Organizations would still further be restricted, in spite of the fact that the legislative assemblies—an important branch in any political Organization—show everywhere a good deal of alacrity in throwing open the flood-gates of legislation and deluging the country with laws, good, bad and indifferent.

The next question that should engage our attention is the way in which these social institutions have been brought into existence. It will be generally admitted that they are partly the result of unconscious

natural forces and partly due to the conscious efforts of man. Indeed there are few societies in which man has not put forth his conscious efforts to improve his social Organization. He has ever been not only a passive participator of the manifold advantages of society but has also been an active agent in ameliorating social conditions. Excepting a few nomadic tribes, all other societies show some sort of organization or other. Not that they are fully equipped with all the contrivances to meet all the complex necessities of modern life; but, in some degree or other, however feebly or inadequately, they have brought about an adjustment between their modest wants and their environment, which we cannot but allow as fairly sufficient for the circumstances. In speaking of most of the existing societies, therefore, the point for decision is not whether they possess any organization or not for carrying on a particular function but whether the organization, they may in all likelihood have, is perfect to serve its purpose.

What then is a perfect social organization? That social organization is perfect which provides for *all* the requisites of society and that *effectively*. In other words, it must be both *complete* and *effective*; it must have institutions to serve all the purposes for which political society exists and serve them most successfully. Conversely, imperfect organization may arise in two ways *viz.*, (i) either by incomplete organization or (ii) by ineffective organization. A society, having certain needs which are not met by any of its existing institutions or having institutions which do not properly serve their purpose, must be termed as 'imperfectly organized'. Evidently therefore the question of perfect or imperfect organization hinges upon the various necessary and accessory functions which a society, as society, should discharge and upon the conditions which further or retard such discharge.

Confining our attention to the political phase of society—for that is the latest-evolved and far and away the most important from our stand-point—the functions fall into two broad groups, viz., (i) the Necessary and (ii) the Accessory. The first has reference to the existence of society and the second to its well-being. The foremost of the necessary functions is the function of self-preservation. A society should protect itself from the attacks of enemies both from without and from within before it could protect the interests of others. To fight the foreign foe military Organization is absolutely necessary and to check anarchical crime and keep the 'forces of disorder' under due control a Legislative and Judicial Organization and a Police

Organization both preventive and detective are indispensable. Next comes the preservation of the lives, honor etc., of the citizens and then the preservation of their property, right etc. For these too the Legislative, the Judicial and the Police Organizations are essential. So the necessary functions we have enumerated require three kinds of necessary Organization viz, (i) the military Organization (ii) the Police Organization and (iii) the Organization to promulgate and administer laws (civil and criminal). Apart from these necessary functions political society has to do certain other accessory functions which though they are not absolutely necessary for the existence of society are necessary for its well-being. The function of maintaining proper diplomatic relations with other states or political societies and the function of maintaining proper relations with its own citizens, regarding their life, liberty, property &c., are two of the most prominent of these accessory functions. The well-being of a political society is certainly jeopardised by any inclination on the part of that society to invade the rights and liberties of other states or of its own citizens. Every state ought accordingly to provide for an efficient diplomatic service and a sytem of constitutional checks whereby the public could be effectively protected from the encroachments of Governmental authorities. That a government, however ideally perfect it may be, if it has not these constitutional checks, must be driven to the commission of unconstitutional acts, goes without saying. Hence arises the necessity of strictly defining the powers of the ruling authority in any form of government, instead of leaving them as a veritable no-man's land for the rulers to occupy at pleasure.

Besides the two kinds of functions mentioned above, political societies, as at present constituted, are called upon to discharge certain supernumerary functions also, such as, marriage legislation, emigration and immigration laws, labour legislation, prevention of suffering by poverty, famine, unemployment, old age and other physical infirmities, sanitation and medical relief, industry and trade, and above all education. These, and a host of other functions besides, do not strictly come under the category of state functions; but yet in the present stage of our social evolution where for the most part the individual has not yet advanced to the extent of realizing in the fullest manner the rights and responsibilities pertaining to his citizenship, aye to his manhood, the state cannot but undertake their performance. We think it needless, in this connection, to recapitulate the results of the fierce controversy which has been for a long time raging between those who

are for expanding the field of governmental activity and those others who are for narrowing it. The keenest of political philosophers, the most far-seeing of practical statesmen and the most humane lovers of mankind have enlisted themselves on the one or the other party and have fought for their respective sides with vast erudition, with consummate ability and above all with a burning zeal to safeguard the best interests of man. The impatient idealists, on the one side, are so dissatisfied with the imperfections of the existing society that they evoke the arm of the law to deal a death-blow to these imperfections, swifty and at once, and be done with them for ever. The impatient individualists, on the other side, are so far captivated by the blessings of liberty that they cannot bring themselves to look upon with unconcern the inroads made into the sanctum of individual liberty by the state, be the purpose what it may. With all the skill, knowledge, experience and political wisdom brought to bear upon it, the controversy has not yet neared any satisfactory settlement. This theoretical discussion notwithstanding, the growth of democracy visible in almost all countries of the world does not augur well for the growth of governmental authority. The expansion of the one spells the restriction of the other. Power is slipping away and will continue to slip away from the hands of the one or a few to the hands of the many. This course of events must inevitably bring about a practical solution of the problem which seems insoluble just at the present moment.

We have been till now considering some of the general aspects of Organization and it now remains for us to apply the principles thereof to India. However much we may belaud the excellence of its domestic Organization we shall have to confess in all humility that much remains to be done by way of social and political Organization. As a society and as a political body we are of course existing but only just existing. We can hardly lay our finger on a common principle of action, or a common ideal or a common method of working for the ideal without at the same time being faced with the difficulties of an opposite principle of action, an opposite ideal and an opposite method. We are great in numbers; we are rich in antique tradition; and above all we are endowed in a special manner with that splendid faculty of dreaming dreams on a gigantic scale. But have we, let us calmly interrogate ourselves, that special faculty of working for an ideal? Have we the genius for details, the calmness to plan, the energy to execute and the patience to wait? Have we the capacity to sink personal differences and join hands for a common work? Have we the rare gift of

forgetting 'self' in the one overmastering idea of an ideal? Have we, in short, 'the vision and faculty divine' of beginning at the right end instead of jumping into blunder by beginning where we ought not? Castles of unsurpassed beauty and magnificence, the splendid creations of architectural art on which the eye feasts with avidity, can be raised only on foundations that remain obscure and cannot be seen by the eye. No national greatness, which at present stands aloft like a pillar of fire and dazzles the world, has become possible without much silent spade work of the most unpretentious kind preceding it. Let us then turn our eyes to the work that lies nearest our hands and see whether we cannot add our mite towards its accomplishment. All idea of flaunting and hankering after vulgar applause should be ruthlessly suppressed.

In systematizing our functions both as a social and as a political body we have to decide first whether we should have separate Organizations for each or whether one Organization would suffice for both just now. The immensity of social work to be turned out and the importance of the political work in a government which is not representative will incline many of our readers to advocate separate Organizations for the two kinds of work. But the following considerations render the divarication of the proposed Organization highly inexpedient. *First*, whatever be the nature and the scope of sectional Organizations, one devoting its attention to one kind of social work another to another kind, and a third to political work or some branch of it, a national Organization, as expressive of national unity, must combine both the works from top to bottom. The separate existence of our national assemblies such as the Congress, the Social Conference, the Industrial Conference, &c. though justifiable on the principle of Division of Labour has brought about a division of interests too. An enthusiast in politics is very lukewarm in social matters and one who is a strong advocate of industrial regeneration prefers somehow not to show his face in political meetings however constitutional they be. Division of Labour there should be of course, but the various sections or Organizations such a division implies should be subsumed under a wider Organization correlating the works of the various branches into one harmonious whole. *Secondly*, a bifurcation of our Organizations will work a mischief far-reaching in its consequences. It must, by the creation of this compartment system, shut out large sections of the society from entering and taking an active, if not a leading part, in one branch or other of our national activity. Politicians will rarely

take interest in social problems and social workers will equally evince very little sympathy towards politics. *Thirdly*, such a division in the absence of a unifying social institution or body may engender rivalry between the two sections and lead to unnecessary friction and wastage of national energy. *Fourthly*, the advantages arising from the favour of government and the disadvantages flowing from its frown will not be equally distributed among the two sets of workers. In nine cases out of ten, the social worker will be basking in the sunshine of official favour while the professional politician runs the risk of being dubbed an agitator, if not subjected to the worse humiliation of being shadowed by the detective. The foregoing reasons are sufficient we believe for concluding that our Organization for doing social and political work should be one and one only and that the different items of work which enter into our national activity in general might be conveniently distributed among the different committees of that one Organization. That is the only way, in our opinion, to keep up the unity of our ideal and the uniformity of method in attaining that ideal.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

THE *Ancient Therapeuts: A Lecture delivered before the Psycho-Therapeutic Society, London, by Princess Karadja of Bovigny Castle, Belgium; Messrs. Wooderson, 4, Great Russell Street, London. W. C., Price 6. Pence*

This lecture on the Ancient Brotherhood of Healers deals with an interesting sect of Western mystics. These Jewish ascetics or Therapeuts branched off from the Essene Brotherhood which was spread all over Palestine and settled on the lake Mareotis in the vicinity of Alexandria. "The great aim of their lives was to restore the Adamic race to spiritual and physical health". The principles they practised for the attainment of this great aim were simple enough :—to love God above all things, to show merciful justice to man and brute and to lead chaste lives. They practised celibacy and owned no private property. They devoted much of their attention to the practice of ethics and never tolerated the idea of master and servant as that was a violation of the Law of Nature. One could become a member of the sect only after a three years' novitiate. They insisted on strict secrecy about their school and veiled their doctrines in symbols, metaphors and allegories. They carried the symbolism to such an extent as to venerate for instance the equilateral triangle and certain letters in the Divine name from which the world was thought to have been created. Their intrepretation of the Christian Scripture was esoteric. "They allegorised and symbolised and finally saw the unseen". "They knew that heaven is a *state* and not a *locality*. Their wish was not to conquer a distant heaven, but to share with others the heaven they carried in their own breasts". Orthodox theology must certainly stand aghast at this subjective interpretation of heaven! They taught moreover that there has never been more than *one* single religion, *revealed* and *re-revealed* all through the ages". Evidently these initiates anticipated the tenets of the modern universal religionists. Moses, Elijah and Jesus are said to have belonged to this Brotherhood of Healers.

The above is a succinct summary of the illuminating lecture by Princess Karadja on one of the most important of ancient mystic sects. The lecture, undoubtedly, exhibits much knowledge and patient research into an obscure and altogether neglected branch of religion.

The Esoteric Meaning of the Seven Sacraments: by Princess

Karadja. Messrs Wooderson, 4, Great Russell Street, W. C. London Price-1 shilling.

This interesting booklet deals with the seven Sacraments administered by the Christian Church. The Church of Rome, having lost the sacred gnosis, the Power of the Keys (potestas clavicum), to unlock the esoteric signification of such ancient mysteries, Luther and others, without the slightest notion of their inner meaning, discarded *five* out of the *seven* sacraments at the time of the Reformation. The Sacraments, according to the Orthodox definition, are the "ordained means of Grace, necessary to salvation, instruments of eternal life, which—through outward and visible signs—transfer to the faithful inward and spiritual grace" and are enumerated as :—(1) Baptism, (2) Confirmation, (3) Eucharist, (4) Penance, (5) Extreme Unction, (6) Holy Orders and (7) Marriage. The difference between the Orthodox and the Gnostic interpretation of these Sacraments is that the former holds that the administration of these outward ceremonies confers inward grace on the soul *ex opero operato*, whereas the latter does not attach any value to mere outward symbols if they could not carry enlightenment or illumination to the soul as in the case of administering baptism to "unconscious infants'. The spiritual interpretation of the seven Sacraments is as follows:—Baptism signifies regeneration of the soul, deliverance from sin, or the birth of Christos in the soul; Confirmation is the completion of Baptism, the mysterious imposition of hands performed in this Sacrament being the magnetic Force indispensable to the proper growth of the germ; Eucharist is the true communion with the Deity by which the soul sacrifices its spiritual prerogatives in order to assist in executing god's plan of Redemption; Penance is the aweful ordeal of inner judgment in which the astral records of each thought, word or deed are presented to the gaze of the soul; Extreme Unction is the utter yielding up of the will; Holy Orders or Priesthood signifies the immolation of self; and Marriage means Unio Mystica or the union with the Divine Spirit. The mystic Ladder of Jacob with seven rungs symbolises these seven stages through which the human soul travels before it is finally absorbed in the Divine spirit. Throughout the book the spiritual interpretation is sustained with much skill and acumen and may be studied with profit by the Orthodox theologians.

Essays on Indian Art, Industry and Education, by Mr. E. B. Havell Published by G. A. Natesan & Co., Esplanade, Madras, Price Re. 1-4 as

The six essays contained in this book are reprints of papers

contributed to the *Nineteenth Century and After*, the *Calcutta Review*, the *East and West* and the *Indian Review*. The *Taj and its Designers* is the first paper and in it is thoroughly exploded the Anglo-Indian legend that the Taj Mahal was the creation of a European architect. A few lines from this piece are worth reproduction. Quoting Sir Edwin Arnold's classic description of the Taj, the writer goes on to say: "This is not a mere flight of poetic fancy, but a deep and true interpretation of the meaning of the Taj. What were the thoughts of the designers, and of Shah Jahan himself, when they resolved to raise a monument of eternal love to the Crown of the Palace—Taj Mahal? Surely not only of a Mausoleum—a sepulchre fashioned after ordinary architectural canons, but of an architectonic ideal symbolical of her womanly grace and beauty. Those critics who have objected to the effeminacy of the architecture unconsciously pay the highest tribute to the genius of the builders. The Taj was meant to be feminine. The whole conception and every line and detail of it express the intention of the designers. It is Mumtaz Mahal herself, radiant in her youthful beauty who still lingers on the banks of the shining Jumna, at early morn, in the glowing mid-day sun, or in the silver moonlight! Or rather, we should say it conveys a more abstract thought, it is India's noble tribute to the grace of Indian womanhood—the Venus de Milo of the East." Surely this is more than praise; it is adoration befitting the object of beauty that has evoked it. In the essay, *Art and Education in India*, the writer deplores the introduction of the false classicism of the West and of the scant support held out to the indigenous artistic talents by government. In the *Uses of Art* the author most successfully demolishes the superficial distinction that is generally made between beauty and utility and proves that perfect fitness (i.e. fitness to serve its purpose or in one word, utility) is perfect beauty. On the whole, one cannot rise from the reading of the essays in this volume without his outlook on Indian Art being widened and his sympathy quickened. We have, therefore, no hesitation in heartily commending the book to our readers.

Kochu Pathumma: a Malayalam Novel by Khabardar, printed at the Swadesabhimani Press, Trivandram, 1901. Price 4 As.

This Muslim story seems to have been written by a Mahomedan, under the *nom de plume* of Khabardar for the social uplift of his race. The book abounds in Mahomedan expressions but is written in a simple and natural style. The plot of the story is good. The religious preaching of Musaliar of Cannanore and the treatment of

Mammi by the Unani Physician of Changanaseri are very humourously depicted and an exact portrait is drawn of the old and the new Police in Travancore. Kochu Pathumma, the heroine, is a faithful pious, virtuous and educated lady and a staunch advocate of female education. The main object of the author in writing this novel seems to be the amelioration of the social condition of his community by the removal of several absurd customs and prejudices to which the community clings with forceful tenacity and by the introduction of female education in their midst. The book deserves to be read by every well-wisher of the Mahomedan community.

Castes and Tribes of Southern India, by Mr. Edgar Thurston, assisted by Mr. K. Rangachari, M. A., in 7 Vols. Government Press, Madras, 1909. Price Rs. 15-

A long and sorely felt want has been supplied by the seven well-written well-illustrated, well-printed and well-bound volumes with which we have been favoured, by the Government Press, Madras. The work has been turned out most magnificently and our first impulse is to congratulate the Government of Madras for having secured the valuable services of Mr. Thurston and his coadjutor Mr. Rangachari for producing such a useful and comprehensive book of reference. To those who know that from an ethnic point of view Southern India is a world in itself, comprising 150 thousand square miles of area and forty million inhabitants with nearly 300 castes and tribes, the stupendousness of this anthropological study needs no demonstration. True the authors have had the advantage of consulting many District Gazetteers, District Manuals, Census Reports, monographs, Transactions of Scientific Societies, Magazine and Newspaper articles &c, for the collection of their materials. But even to wade through these huge piles, cull the requisite information therefrom and throw it into anything like a system is no easy task. In the volumes before us, however, we have distinctive marks of original research regarding many caste-groups and clans. To facilitate reference an alphabetic arrangement has been followed in the book. Along with the names of castes and tribes, the names of titles, such as, Annavi, Asan, Vaidyan, Talaivan, Talaiyari and of ceremonies as Tulabharam, Talikettukalyanam also occur. These might very well have been relegated to the headings of the particular castes or tribes, who bear the titles or perform the ceremonies. Here and there a few slight errors too have crept in and we hope they will disappear from the pages of this excellent production in another edition. In page 307,

Vol. II, Kuha is said to have rowed the boat of Rama to Ceylon. Kuha helped Rama only to cross the Ganges and not the southern sea. In pages 168, Vol. VII, we read "Nor do the Anjuthilkar women wear a white dress like the Tenkanchis &c." The Tenkanchis themselves being the Anjuttilkars (vide page 167, Vol. VII) the term Munnutilkar should be substituted for Anjuttilkar in the above. Again in page 243, Vol. V, we have "Stories of Chitragupta, the accountant general of Yama, the Indian Pluto are recited on the New-moon day in the month of Chittiray (April-May) with great devotion." Evidently new-moon day in this is a mistake for full-moon day. Under the heading Nanchinad Vellalars we find the following: "Their manners and customs at the present day are so different to those of the Tamil Vellalas that they may be regarded as a separate caste indigenous to Travancore and Cochin." Except in the matter of inheritance of property and of widow-marriage, the Nanchinad Vêlâlas have exactly the same manners and customs as the Tamil Vêlâlas and are moreover not indigenous to Travancore. If tradition is of any value, the leading families of Nanchinad still claim to have colonized the southern Taluqs of Travancore from the adjacent British Districts of Tinnevelly and Madura. Again the statement taken from Mr. Soobramonia Aiyar that Saiva Nanchinad Vellalars will not take food in the houses of the Asaiva Nanchinad Vellalars and that several families of the Nanchinad Vellalars have adopted the name of Nanchinad Nayar as their caste name require correction, unless we think it sufficient to judge of a class from individual eccentricities merely. The term Nanchinad Nayar is as absurd as that other term 'Pandy Súdra' coined by some ignoramus in caste-ridden Travancore to denote a Vêlâla. It may be remarked here that some of the errors to which we have drawn the readers' attention have been due to the authors implicitly following the notes of Mr. N. Subramania Aiyar of Travancore Government service. Coming to the name Vellala, we are hereunder presented with a string of fanciful derivations by Western scholars, who would not, before beginning to exercise their philological ingenuity upon an innocent-looking word, take the very necessary precaution of making themselves sure, whether they have got at the right form of that word. Instead of taking their stand on such terra firma they generally occupy a coludland of their own and launch into most bewildering speculation. Both Mr. H. A. Stuart and Dr. Oppert have thus fallen into ridiculous blunders in deriving the word Vellalan. Mr. Stuart derives the term from Vellanmai meaning *Vellam*, water and *anmai*, management. Dr Oppert brings about an etymological

connection between Vellalan and Pallan. Neither of these scholars saw that there was no such word as Vellalan in Tamil Literature and that it was only a popular corruption of Vêlâlan and as such has no conceivable connection either with Vellam (flood) or with that rhyming word Pallam or Pallan. We think Mr. Stuart's is probably the first instance in which an attempt has been made to derive a substantive from an abstract name (Vellalan from Vellanmai); and Dr. Oppert's performance, we must plainly confess from an ethnic point of view, is indeed bordering on the miraculous in juxtapositing two castes standing at the two opposite poles of the Dravidian world. Nay, it is still doubtful in spite of Dr. Caldwell's efforts whether Pallan could be brought within the pale of the Dravidian race. That the Vêlâlas are the highest caste in the eighteen professional castes of Tamilagam needs no proof. If proof were necessary, the very terms Karukkumattai Vellalars, Irkuli Vellalars, Guha Vellalars, said to have been assumed by some Santars, (corrupted into Shanars), Vannârs, and Chempadavans would be sufficient to establish the social status of the Vêlâlas. Take with this the general tendency in lower castes of assuming the Vêlâla caste-title Pillai and we shall get a correct notion of the Vêlâlas' social position. The Tamil proverb quoted and mistranslated in page 7 of Vol I also strengthens our position. We fear however the translator has taken liberty with the proverb and tacked on to it something of his own by which he wants to place Mudaliar above Vêlâlar, though both them belong to the same caste. Apparently the title Mudaliar has misled the translator. It must be understood by all those who betake themselves to the study of South Indian castes, that there are honorific titles belonging to each caste, which can on no account bear a literal interpretation. With all their speciousness these titles are highly valued by the various castes and any omission to add these titles to their personal names would only be looked upon as nothing short of an insult. Take for instance *Pillai or Mudaliar* for Vêlâlars, *Devan* for Maravan, *Kon* for Idaiyan, *Mûppan* for Vàniyan, *Nadar* for Shanar etc. These titles should not, be literally interpreted but were and are merely honorific.

We are sorry we are unable to notice this important work at greater length in this issue. The encyclopœdic nature of the work itself forbids any ambitious undertaking to compress what we have to say in a single article. We shall, however, revert to some one or other aspect of this work in subsequent numbers of the Review.